

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>o</sup> VI. JANUARY 1877.

---

ART. I.—HISTORY OF THE JEWISH CHURCH.

*Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. Third Series. From the Captivity to the Christian Era. With Two Maps. (London: John Murray, 1876.)

‘QUICQUID sibi imperavit animus,’ declares the Roman moralist Seneca, ‘obtinuit.’ The mind obtains that which it proposes to itself; the eye sees that which it came to see. This is a principle of very wide application; and in nothing is its working more evident than in the pursuit of literature. The preconceived purpose of the student colours the results at which he arrives; it would hardly be too much to say that it often prescribes them absolutely. And if this be true of the inquiries of secular literature, it is emphatically true of those into which religion enters; because religion touches a man more nearly; it is (as it were) a part of his soul; his stake in its truth or falsehood is the vastest of all stakes—to him: and therefore in this matter which touches him so nearly, he is less than ever a calm, passionless intelligence. His prejudices or his wishes distort his judgment; his fears blind his eyes; and his results are often not worth the paper on which they were written.

This is unhappily to some extent true, even of the gravest and most patient investigations of those Sacred Records whose inner meaning is the key to the moral history of humanity, whilst their outer envelope is composed of memorials, as

varied in form as humanity itself, and stretching back to the earliest ages of man's dwelling upon the earth. They are a mine in which every one may dig ; a field where all comers glean at pleasure, and take to themselves various and very different rewards for their labours. Just as the earth nourishes a thousand species of trees, and each draws from the same soil its own peculiar nutriment ; or as the bee collects honey while another insect secretes only poison, when yet they are ranging over the same plot of ground ; so with students of the Sacred Scriptures. *Quot homines tot sententiæ* ; and that in the widest sense. The archæologist finds in them the wherewithal to reconstruct, in fancy, a social system that has long passed away ; the philologer lights upon a treasure-house of archaic words and forms of speech ; the poet drinks in with the admiration of a kindred soul the distant echoes of far-off songs which have been preserved in their pages : the historian has in them an opportunity of tracing the life story of a nation from its birth to its decline with an altogether unique completeness. And by the side of these merely secular and incidental uses of the record, thousands of simple and unsophisticated souls are, in every generation, putting it to a higher and truer use, and feeding the lamp of their own spiritual earnestness at its glowing pages. The theologian may find in it the precious material for his systems of *Credenda* ; but the meek and lowly will, after all, prize it most, for he gains from it the only hopes which transfigure and glorify for him the harsh realities and the bitter trials of his earthly life ; while, alas, the sceptic with perverted ingenuity contrives so to misapply its contents as to extract from them the poison of fancied arguments against their value or their authenticity.}

The volume before us, the successor, as our readers are well aware, of foregoing similar volumes, is indeed a study or a series of studies of the Sacred Scripture and matters connected therewith ; and yet we could hardly put it under any of the classes we have named. The history, as narrated therein, is avowedly mixed up with stories of doubtful authority, or even with mere fables. The references to philology are always cursory and generally at second-hand. The criticism is for the most part Ewald done into English. Much the same thing may be said of the philosophy. It is in its treatment of the Biblical literature on its scenic and poetical sides that the main strength of the work lies ; and what that is we shall see as we go on.

The main design pursued in the Lectures, or one of the main designs, would seem to have been the making of *word-pictures* ;



in which the author has unquestionably succeeded. We may call it the *picturesque* manner of handling the Scripture. Where graver writers would find a moral or a warning, Dr. Stanley not unfrequently finds a telling 'subject.' The sinner's crimes are condoned for the sake of the splendid figure he makes upon the canvas, just as the rags of the *contadina* or the bandit turn to adornments under the artist's hand. From the downfall of a nation or the declension of a creed, he often gets nothing better than the material for an epigrammatic phrase or a sparkling description. We do not say that he may not feel with genuine sympathy the tragic importance of the events which he describes with such elegant self-possession. But with him the emotions have been carefully trained, and move in a well-contrived *manège*.

And thus his works in general, and this work in particular, seem to us wanting in reality and strength of religious purpose. They are the apotheosis of sentiment. Artistic considerations count for too much with him. As Nero fiddled on the Palatine at the spectacle of the burning of Rome, so the author of this volume finds too willingly his artistic *motif* in the disasters and sufferings of the subjects of his narrative. There is a degree in which to do this is perfectly legitimate. But it appears to us that, if not in former volumes on similar subjects, yet certainly in this, that limit has been passed. It is one thing for a narrator to seize the picture by the way and where it already exists. That is the special power of the artist in every department. But it is quite another thing to subordinate the due evolution of the facts to the manufacture of *tableaux*. Such a method may issue in a very brilliant and skilfully worked series of pictures; it can scarcely add to the reader's insight into the inner meaning of the events narrated, or permanently deepen the impression which they make.

The class of book to which these Lectures belong is a small one. Few men have the literary ability necessary to work up such brilliant sketches as these. And the fundamental danger which belongs to them is, that the artistic purpose is apt to overcome the moral; that the object of them may come to be to form a series of dissolving views excessively pretty and equally unsubstantial, rather than to elucidate and enforce the truths of morality and religion. Here the converse process to the parable takes place: instead of the parable being sought for the sake of the underlying moral lesson, the moral is cast into the shade, and even the facts sometimes manipulated, for the sake of the outward graces of the narrative.

It may perhaps be thought that in the case of the volume before us, at all events, excuses are not wanting. It was a magnificent subject that lay before the canvas. It may be true, as the author insists, that 'in point of interest the period comprised in the following pages falls below that of the two previous volumes,' and yet much of various and absorbing incident may remain. Relatively to greater men and more stirring epochs, the period of the Captivity and the Return, with the men who were the actors in either, may seem tame and dwarfed; while yet in itself, and absolutely, the period is full of interest, and the actors are really heroes. But to us the alleged inferiority is not apparent. The interest is of a different kind and centred upon different objects; but it is not less in degree. Rather it is greater and deeper, since to all the claims which the Hebrew story has upon our sympathy and admiration, is added in this age the element, perhaps missing in earlier and more prosperous times, of *tragedy*. The stream of events deepens and widens as it nears the torrent; the stage of history fills with actors as we approach the catastrophe, as it might seem, of the destinies of the nation. It is not by Israel in the time of her proudest empire, when the deserts were traversed by her tributary caravans, and her fleets went north and south and returned, bringing 'gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks,' that the reader's fullest sympathy with her is aroused; but by *Judea capta*, sitting as an unwilling denizen by the streams of a strange land, and hanging her harp 'upon the trees that were therein.' The splendour and the power and the greatness are gone, but it is only to give place to the mass of the people; the leaders are comparatively lowly, but they do not fail to draw and to hold attention and sympathy; there is more of pathos and patient heroism in the persistent and finally successful effort to raise up the fallen city of Jerusalem, than the nation had ever shown in its day of complete and rejoicing triumph. And is it for us to accuse a period like this as if it lacked the elements of historic interest?

A similar remark may be made concerning the *literature* of the Captivity. So far from its being true that this is wanting in interest, it was precisely during this time that it attained its highest point. Like all periods of sorrow and trial, it was fruitful in poetic and inspired utterance. The nation 'learned in suffering what it taught in song.' To name Isaiah, Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, even if we forbear for the moment to speak of Daniel, is sufficient to excite wonder that the statement could have been made, however cursorily, while Pro-

phets so many and so distinguished belong to this period, and fully establish its right to be regarded as unusually, and even specifically, creative, and that too in the very highest region of thought.

If, therefore, we should find these Lectures deficient in energy and variety, in brilliancy of colour and accuracy of thought, it will not be permissible to lay the blame upon the barrenness of the period treated of. But in fact we shall find the apology a conventional and altogether superfluous one. The literary art displayed was never more consummate; and the Lectures, if not so bright with 'barbaric pearl and gold,' not so rich with the apologue and legend of an earlier and simpler age, have sources of interest all their own.

The period of history here embraced falls naturally into four great periods,—the Babylonian dominion and the Captivity, the fall of Babylon, and with it of the greatest empire of the ancient world; the Persian dominion, embracing the Return of the exiles, the careers, nearly parallel, of Ezra and Nehemiah, the first of the great scribes, and the first also of those laymen in whose breasts the stern and potent fire of Jewish orthodoxy burned more fiercely than even in the priests; the Grecian period, during which Israel, bent for a moment under the irresistible power of Alexander the Great, rose once more, and in a succession of bloody contests regained her freedom and held it for a time under the Maccabæan leaders; and, lastly, the Roman dominion—a period of cruelty and storm, when the strong hand, and that alone, ruled among men; when perfidies the most shameless, cruelties the most revolting, were matters of common occurrence in the unhappy nation, the cup of whose iniquities was so nearly full; and then, as if to form a strange and terrible overture to the coming of the Saviour and Prince of Peace, the troubled and unquiet reign of Herod.

Such is the ground-plan of the Lectures. If we now inquire how this plan is executed, we shall find the workmanship very unequal. The author comes here and there into collision with matters of criticism, and with such he invariably deals in a perfunctory and unsatisfactory manner, and expresses his opinions too obviously at second hand. But where he may run on with that facile and flowing narrative of which he is so unquestionably a master, all is well enough. The great city of Babylon was a tempting subject for his pen. The plains from which it rose were not then, as now, bare and scorching wastes of barren sand. They were irrigated with in-

numerable watercourses, poplar-shaded, bordered with a mosaic of meadow flowers, encompassed with a perfect sea of waving corn. The fertility of these seemingly barren plains was then so great that the traveller, Herodotus, hardly expected to be believed when he reported it as two or even three hundred fold. Out of the bosom of these billows of grain rose the great city, encompassed with its deep and wide moat, which the Euphrates kept continually full, and enclosed, far as the eye could reach, with its vast walls. Fifteen miles each way ran the sides of their huge parallelogram; they were three hundred feet high and seventy-five feet in thickness (not eighty, as Dr. Stanley states), that is, as he reminds his readers, nearly as high as the Victoria Tower at Westminster—veritable mountains of brick!

So remarkable an exterior enclosed a city no less remarkable. It was more than a mere city—it was an empire in miniature. The houses were interspersed with gardens, parks, and even forests. Canals wound in and out among the stately boulevards. Through its hundred brazen gates streamed forward and backward the endless tide of life, coming and going upon the errands of its vast commerce, or its sleepless and far-reaching despotism.

Not less striking to the spectator must have been the houses themselves. Arranged, contrary to the usual habit of Eastern cities, in streets which were broad and open, many of them surrounded with their gardens and palm-groves, each building was painted with brilliant hues, and shone and sparkled in all its splendour of colour like a gem from its setting. Above all towered the temples, from whose flat and elevated roofs the Magians studied the motions of the stars with the aid of all the (now utterly lost) science of that marvellous age. Of that hierarchy, a reader of the English Bible need hardly be reminded, Daniel was one of the highest dignitaries; for so we must understand the phrase in Dan. v. 2, 'master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldeans, and sooth-sayers.' Higher than all towered the great Temple of Belus, which was a stadium or furlong in height according to Strabo.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Though Dr. Stanley, following Mr. Grote (*Greece*, iii. 297), suggests that this was the *winding* and not the *perpendicular* height. This, however, would reduce the height to a mere fraction of the distance named by the traveller, and seems to us thereby inadmissible. The perpendicular height of a stadium = 606 English feet, probably may have included that of the mound upon which the temple was raised, and the whole dimension seems to fit well enough the gigantic scale upon which the public buildings of Babylon were constructed. It is by no means incredible that in a city, whose mere *walls* were 300 feet in height and 60 miles in periphery,

Of this temple, we are carefully told, 'the several stages were black, orange, crimson, gold, deep yellow, brilliant blue, and silver. The white or pale brown of the houses, wherever the natural colour of the bricks was left, must have been strikingly contrasted with the rainbow hues with which most of them were painted.' The population, too, of this great city was, we may suppose with great probability, such as to enliven and adorn even the gorgeous habitation in which it dwelt. The palace of the sovereign of this great empire was within one of the two great divisions, and with its parks, and hanging gardens famous in history, formed an enclosure of seven miles in circumference. With the court would also come its small army of life-guards, and all the miscellaneous crowds of officials employed in the business of government; each and all of these adding new elements of stir and bustle and splendour, of which we may be sure the quick imagination of the Jewish captives, or, at all events, of such as Ezekiel, Baruch, Isaiah, or Daniel, took good heed. The description of Dr. Stanley here is as stirring and picturesque as it is accurate:

'Nowhere else in Asia, hardly even in Egypt, could have been seen the magnificent cavalry careering through the streets, the chariots and four, "chariots like whirlwinds," "horses, swifter than eagles,"—horses and chariots, and "horsemen and companies," with "spears" and "burnished helmets." Nowhere else could have been imagined the long muster-roll, as of a peerage, that passes in long procession before the eye of the Israelite captive—"the satraps, captains, pachas, the chief judges, treasurers, judges, councillors, and all the rulers of the provinces." Their splendid costumes of scarlet—their variegated sashes—"all of them princes to look to;" their elaborate armour—"buckler, and shield, and helmet"—their breast-plates, their bows and quivers, and battleaxes, marked out to every eye the power and grandeur of the army. Nowhere was science or art so visibly exalted, as in "the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers, and the wise Chaldeans," who were expected to unravel all the secrets of nature, and who in point of fact, from those wide level plains, "where the entire celestial hemisphere is continually visible to every eye, and where the clear transparent atmosphere shows night after night the heavens gemmed with countless stars of undimmed brilliancy," had laid the first foundations of astronomy, mingled as it was with the speculations, then deemed as of yet deeper significance, of astrology'—(p. 9.)

And of the vast port for ocean-going ships, which was a temple might be piled up to the height of 600 feet. It is to be borne in mind further, that the Great Pyramid of Egypt was certainly 480 feet high.

formed by artificial diversion of the course of the Euphrates, we have said nothing. But we have, as we hope, made it clear with what graphic power and careful collection of facts certain aspects of the ancient world are conceived by the present writer, and represented in his work. So magnificent a background it is that he has prepared for the story of the Captivity and the Return. That story, however, as it is told in these pages, is disappointing. These events should teach great lessons, and too many of them Dr. Stanley sets himself to minimise. Too much of his energy has been put into the landscape and the accessories: too little is left for the due appreciation of the actors and the incidents of the drama. Unfortunately, too, the inferences actually drawn are mostly in the interest of a special school in theology. It would seem that he is ever on the watch to aim a shaft at his ecclesiastical opponents from under the covert of the events which he is professedly describing. And we cannot often agree with him in the view that he takes even of historical facts. Thus nothing is more marked in the annals of the Jews than the change which the Babylonian captivity wrought in their disposition to idolatry. Before so prone 'to inflame themselves with idols under every green tree,' they were found after their return simply and consistently, and even stubbornly monotheist, throughout the ages that remained of their national history. The fact is undoubted: what is the explanation of it? And here Dr. Stanley, according to his wont, goes off into rhetorical declamation about 'iconoclast fervour' and 'the recoil against the extravagances of Babylonian worship' (p. 31) and so on. We can see nothing of all this in the facts—no iconoclasm at all, neither then nor later. To our mind the simple explanation is this—that in the case of the remnant who returned from Babylon *monotheism became identified with their nationality*. The repulsion from their oppressors, and dislike of their peculiar worship and customs, which cruelty and insult would most surely arouse in their minds, would help this feeling; and later history, *e.g.* that of the ante-Maccabæan period, tells us plainly enough how fierce a repulsion it was that, under such circumstances, the Jewish mind was able to conceive and retain. Suffering and oppression welded them, as it has done peoples before and since, into a rigid, unyielding form. They revered their smallest peculiarities as being connected with vital truths. The instinct of national self-preservation assisted to intensify their grasp of that which belonged really to the nation's life. The life-blood of the race, whose distinctive existence was threatened, retreated as it were to the heart, to



struggle against the deadly influence which attacked it ; and unquestionably the very heart of the Jewish nation—its *raison d'être*, the core of its vitality—was monotheism.

A like destructive tendency is even more distinctly traceable in Lect. xlv., on Ezra and Nehemiah. Besides this, there is throughout the volume a habit of quoting, with pointed and repeated approval, from writers who cannot be called Christian at all, or only by the widest measure of toleration. Dr. Stanley seems to range himself avowedly and defiantly on the side of those from whom the Christian world—and none more decidedly than Christian scholars,—have recoiled in disapproval and distrust.<sup>1</sup> There may be somewhat of chivalric feeling prompting him to this course. We trust that it is so. But it is, unhappily, far more probable that we have here the natural outcome of latitudinarian principles, long and distinctly held. And if it be so, then the development of them put forth in this volume, startling as it is compared with former works, will not be the last or final development. There is little variation in the action of principles like these. They tend continually to widen their boundaries. They are imprisoned forces, sapping ceaselessly at the barriers which confine them, and sure to effect their egress, sooner or later, at the weakest point. In fact, the scepticism which commences its operations upon the Creed with 'I believe,' is probably illogical if it leaves many,—or even any,—of the articles of the very Creed itself intact.

The present author then can have little reason to complain if he is supposed to agree (at all events, as far as the nature of the case will permit, that is to say, upon negative conclusions or not-believing—the 'gran'fundamental principle o' want o' breeks') with those writers whom he quotes with eulogy and without a word of warning or disapproval. To him M. Renan seems to be, not the rash and sceptical theorist, who has turned the timeworn and venerable story of the Gospel into a tawdry melodrama in the manner of the modern French stage, but the 'accomplished scholar' (p. xix. Preface) who has 'done much' in the 'interesting field' of portraying the historical appearance of the Founder and the first teachers of Christianity'—(p. xxii.) He quotes from Rousseau, towards the end of his book, a passage of near two

<sup>1</sup> Thus, who are his authorities? Such men as Matthew Arnold, Dr. Colenso, A. H. Clough, Dr. Jowett; whilst he goes out of his way in one passage to compliment M. Renan, in another to quote from Rousseau; and follows the guidance of Ewald from one end of his book to the other.



pages (pp. 474, 475) long, and does not hint that the greater part of what this author wrote is dangerous in the extreme, infinitely more so than even the vague and questionable platitudes of his quotation. Him also Dr. Stanley describes as a 'famous writer of the last century, who saw with a clearness of insight which, if troubled by violent and unworthy passions, was not distorted by ecclesiastical prejudice'—(p. 474.) And no doubt the last clause of the sentence is true enough; and the fact that Rousseau was not a Catholic Christian covers a multitude of sins in Dr. Stanley's eyes.

But, after all, the saying '*Noscitur a sociis*' is not infallibly true. It may mislead in any particular case. Various circumstances may cause a writer to wear the outward appearance of agreement with men between whom and himself there is but little really in common. If then we shall find that, whatever be the character of the writers whose works the Lecturer has been consulting, he, for his part, has taken nothing but what is good and orthodox in their conclusions, and rejected the evil which might be mixed with them, we shall be willing to believe that his Lectures may be trustworthy as well as brilliant. If we shall find that whilst he assigns their full value, according to the very purpose of his work, to the outward circumstances which tended, in God's good Providence, to shape the outward embodiment of the Truth, whether historical and shown in the ordered march of events, or mental and literary, as the growing perception of moral truth and fitness developed itself in the minds of such as were raised above their fellows by exceptional gifts of intellect and expression, who had more than others 'the vision and the faculty divine,' and were by them in process of time committed to writing and formed into books; if, we say, while assigning to these their full power and effectiveness, he has yet retained the consciousness that Truth is from above and not from beneath; not wholly developed out of the consciousness of man, but revealed to him by the inspiring Spirit of God; then, however 'distasteful and alarming' (as Dr. Stanley himself seems aware—p. xvii.) the particular conclusions might be, to which he came, ours should not be the voice raised to reprehend his freedom. So much of our knowledge respecting abstract truth is tentative and incomplete, and we see so imperfectly as yet the mutual relations of allied truths, that differing views and various opinions there must needs be amongst us. Each man sees the truth at a different angle from his fellow. And therefore there must necessarily be between Christians a considerable measure of

mutual toleration, and of difference of opinion patiently borne. Questions upon which the Divine Scripture has not expressly pronounced, questions which the voice of the Church has not expressly ruled, these form a margin, and a wide one, around the Creed, concerning which men must be content for a time to differ. Every age of prevailing mental activity approaches such questions—probably it approaches *all* questions, from its own point of view. No criterion can be so searching, no tribunal so severe, as that to which every formula and every belief is thus subjected during the slow lapse of ages. No one generation, nor even one century, is the length of the judicial session; not a single race or group of races, but mankind at large, have to form their judgment; and not unfrequently it happens that the lenient decision which a too favourable combination of circumstances had enabled a doctrine to snatch, is replaced by the severer, but more equitable verdict of succeeding ages. *Magna est veritas, et prævalebit*; and Truth issues purest and least mixed at length from the strife of warring tongues. As it is the strongest race that survives and comes forth eventually victorious from the Conflict of Species; so it is the Truth and nothing else that in the long run emerges from the warring passions and the busy intellects of thinkers. None of us therefore need affect to take the Truth under our private protection. It is greater than we, and longer lived. The polemic of any given age forms but in an infinitesimal degree a factor of it. It envelops all time in the process of its evolution; but it can be but imperfectly comprehended by the finite mind, even taken collectively; and the men of any one age see only that part of it which they are capable of discerning, which is probably the merest fraction of the whole.

The practical issue of this line of thought is a large and generous measure of *toleration*. It is a truth which earnest men in all ages are ever slow to learn and to act upon, and generally the slower the more earnest they are. The Catholic Church, the most earnest of all institutions, has felt above all others this very difficulty. Because it has been so anxious for men's souls, it has hardly known how to bear with their wrongheadedness; and it has perhaps been reserved for our own generation formally to acknowledge if not fully to practise toleration as an integral part of Christian duty. The circumstances of our time, no less than the moral consciousness of Catholic Christians, constrain thinkers more and more to be tolerant of differences of mere opinion within certain definite, and not very narrow, limits. We need perhaps

hardly add the *cautela*, that by toleration we do not mean carelessness of dogma; nor by breadth of mind an impartial indifference to opposing views.

We have premised these observations in order to show that if at times we pronounce Dr. Stanley's half-veiled, half-hinted conclusions to be intolerably mischievous, it is not for want of an adequate conception on our part of the duty of a frank and liberal toleration of different shades of opinion. Varieties of opinion may surely be pardoned; but *entire want* of belief, a general scepticism of view which regards no statement, historical or dogmatic, as trustworthy, is a barren tree, and simply cumbers the ground of thought.

We fully expect, when we approach, in Lect. xlv., the narrative of the linked careers of Ezra and Nehemiah, to find that the author has but scant sympathy with these Reformers in their successful endeavours to recall the Jewish nation to a nearer approximation to its earliest ideal; and we are not mistaken. He is unable to feel any great enthusiasm for either of the leaders. He cannot enter heartily into the details of their work. The episode of the mixed marriages, and the action taken about them, seems to him a retrograde step. It was 'in some respects a questionable occasion.' The conduct of Ezra was a declension from 'the larger, nobler, freer views which belonged to the earlier and also to the later portion of the Jewish history.' He talks of 'the loftier tone of the sacred narrative' as 'silencing unfavourable comments upon the mixed marriages of Abraham or of Moses,' and is to our judgment utterly fanciful in so doing, since the circumstances were entirely different in each case to those amid which Ezra found himself; and secondly, these facts are, in each instance, recorded without blame, indeed, but also without a word of praise, or even condonation. And it is very characteristic of the writer that the mention of the mass-meeting of the Jews to consider this subject, furnishes him with an occasion to gird at the Christian idea of the Church, while Nehemiah xi. 6, 14, 16, gives him opportunity for a sneer at the homeliness of the primary meanings of the terms 'presbyter' and 'bishop.' And he is clearly inaccurate in stating that here—

'We stumble on the first distinct notice of that popular element which, deriving in later times its Grecian name from the Athenian assemblies, passed into the early Christian community under the title of *Ecclesia*, and thus became the germ of that idea of the "Church," in which the voice of the people or laity had supreme control over the teachers and rulers of the society—an idea preserved in

the first century in its integrity, retained in some occasional instances down to the eleventh century, then almost entirely superseded by the mediæval schemes of ecclesiastical polity, until it reappeared, although in modified and disjointed forms, in the sixteenth and following centuries'—(p. 121.)

The statement is, in fact, incorrect in all its parts. Such mass-meetings were, we do not say common, but well known from the very earliest times of Jewish national existence. To go no further than Exod. xix. 17, or Deut. ix. 10 and xviii. 16, we have both name (*ἐκκλησία* or *λαός*, LXX.) and thing. Then, in the second place, neither in the Jewish Church nor in the Christian Church were these ever sovereign governing assemblies, like, *e.g.* the English Parliament. At certain conjunctures, such as the election of a bishop, they had a concurrent voice with the clergy. At no time had they 'supreme control over the teachers and rulers of the society;' and this is demonstrable—as far as the Apostolic age is concerned—from the evidence still extant in the Acts of the Apostles and the Pastoral Epistles.

We light upon another of these pretentious generalisations on p. 131:—

'From this point the great restorers of Jerusalem, who hitherto had moved in spheres apart—the aged Scribe, absorbed in the study of the ancient law: the young layman, half warrior, half statesman, absorbed in the fortification of the city—were drawn closer and closer together, and henceforth, whether in legend or history, they became indistinguishably blended. The narrative of Nehemiah himself does not again mention Ezra; but it is devoted to deeds which, whether for good or evil, might almost equally belong to both. It is not the last time that the architect or the engineer has been the colleague of the reformer or theologian. Vauban saw more, felt more keenly the true needs of France than Fénelon or Bossuet'—(p. 131.)

It may be our dulness, but we cannot see the relevance of this historical parallel—only that it is of course meant to throw blame upon the theologian, as though *he* were blind where the layman was quick-sighted and in earnest. We cannot see what is intended by it. Why should *not* the architect or the engineer, or anybody else, down to the scavenger, be the colleague of the reformer or theologian? Such persons very often are, happily, in our own day; but it argues no exceptional blindness on the side of him on whom the higher work is ordinarily laid. *Sanitas, hygiene*, has its recognised part to play in the defence and well-ordering of this our Zion; and the larger the part the better probably will the work be done.

More intelligible and in better taste is Dr. Stanley's comment on the self-gratulatory peroration of Nehemiah xiii. 31. There is real and quiet humour in the way he points out the amusing naturalness and grotesque juxtaposition of a petty but troublesome question, side by side with high and permanent interests. It is not every writer who sees this element in the narrative, or can describe it so felicitously; and in such matters it is that, as we all know, the Lecturer's main strength lies.

Dr. Stanley fights very shy of critical questions in the present volume; and, following his habit, he glides very warily over the question of Ezra and his relation as editor to the Canon of Old Testament Scripture. But, as far as we have seen, he has avoided material misstatement. His rage for historical parallels carries him, unquestionably, too far in certain passages. He does not invariably bear in mind, that in proportion as an historical parallel is imperfect, it misleads instead of illustrates. We could quite dispense with the comparison of Nehemiah, the pious and orthodox governor of Jerusalem, collecting 'floating records' from Jerusalem and its vicinity (which had been a ruin, be it remembered, and uninhabited for half a century or more), 'like the Reliques which Percy or Scott collected from the holes and corners of English minstrelsy, or Livy from the halls of Roman nobles'—(p. 143.) It is an unfair representation, again, of the Levitical priest, not to say an offensive one, to describe him as 'deriving his sanctity from his clothes, with his strong arms imbrued, like a butcher's, in the blood of a cow or a sheep:' or where he speaks still more contemptuously, on the next page, of the 'mechanical, bullock-slaying, fumigating functions of the priesthood.' This kind of reference to a class is wilfully disrespectful, inadequate, and unfair; and for all his expansive sentiment and sympathy in certain directions, Dr. Stanley can be very unfair to what he does not like. Quite in character, again, is his complaint, that—

'To erect hedges round the Gospel has been the effort, happily not continuous, or uniform, but of large and dominant sections of the scribes of Christianity, until the words of its Founder have well nigh disappeared behind the successive intrenchments, and fences, and outposts, and counterworks of Councils, and Synods, and Popes and anti-Popes, and Sums of Theology and of Saving Doctrine, of confessions of faith and schemes of salvation'—(p. 149.)

We have heard this kind of talk before; and a very little suffices to provoke a gush of it from Dr. Stanley. It is an easy task to decry what one does not like; and it is no secret

that the present writer does not like, and rebels against being supposed to concur in, the definite and orderly teaching of systematic theology. If he is to be excused at all for a habit of talk so superficial and so weak, it can only be on the ground of an incurable inability to realise that if religion is not to remain a vague, chaotic, formless sentiment of reverence and worship, dumb and without utterance, inoperative, and without influence upon life and conduct; liable to evaporate at the smallest attempt to grasp and realise it; if that is not to be the case, its floating conceptions must be fixed and connected; its truths concatenated into a systematic whole; in fact, you must have a theology.

The Lecture is intensely disagreeable, because of these covert attacks upon doctrine; but it exhibits none the less a considerable degree of intimate realisation of (we can hardly say sympathy with) the period of the Return from Captivity, and the renewed national life which swelled forth thence with such significant vigour. And there is some truth and beauty, though oddly mixed with much that is unreal, in the following:

‘It is evident that in the Scribes rather than in any of the other functionaries of the Jewish Church is the nearest original of the clergy of later times. \* \* \*

‘The finer elements of the widely-ramifying institution thus inaugurated appear at its outset. It was the permanent triumph of the moral over the purely mechanical functions of worship. The prophets had effected this to a certain extent; but their appearance was so fitful—their gifts so irregular—that they were always, so to speak, outside the system, rather than a part of it—Preaching Friars, Non-conformists, or, at the most, occasional Conformists on the grandest scale. But from the time of Ezra the Scribes never ceased. The intention of their office, as first realised in him and his companions, was the earnest endeavour to reproduce, to study, to translate, represent in the language of his own time, the oracles of sacred antiquity; to ascertain the meaning of dark words, to give life to dead forms, to enforce forgotten duties: to stimulate the apathy of the present by invoking the loftier spirit of the past. Such was the ideal of the “Minister of Religion” henceforth; and when the Highest Teacher described it in His own words He found none better than to take the office of Ezra, and say: “Every Scribe which is instructed unto the Kingdom of Heaven, is like unto an householder which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.”—(pp. 146, 147.) \* \*

‘They were again the first distinct and incontestable examples of that antiquarian, scholastic, critical treatment of the ancient history and literature of the country, which succeeds and is inferior to the periods of original genius and inspiration, but is itself an indispensable element of instruction. \* \* \*

‘Nehemiah, when he came to Jerusalem, not contented with the



rough work of building and fighting, dived into the archives of the former generations, and thence dug out and carefully preserved the register of the names, properties, and pedigrees of those who had returned in the original exile. Some other antiquary or topographer must in other days have done the like for that which we have called elsewhere the Domesday Book of Canaan in the Book of Joshua'—(pp. 138, 139.)

Lecture xlv. is occupied with the period when Malachi (if that were really the name of the Prophet, or only the descriptive appellation by which he was known)<sup>1</sup> gave forth the last utterance of the Old Testament prophecy, and closed with his final words a literature inspired and inspiring, which had been growing for eleven hundred years. It will hardly be denied that the old cycle closes amid sadness and gloom. The Chosen People were demoralised; their national fibre seemed to be thinning out; their special characteristics were giving way; the priests were profaning holy things; the laity filling the earth with bloodshed and violence; the seer despairs altogether of the present, and throws himself forward upon the future; and so the curtain falls, to rise again only for the coming of the promised Messiah.

It is in strict accordance with the practice of the Prophets who had preceded him, that we find, under these circumstances of sadness and discouragement, on the part of this Prophet a recurrence to a type of religion more elevated and more spiritual than that by which he was surrounded. It was the function of the Prophet so to do. Whatever natural nobleness there was in his mind rose in revolt against the moral declension around him, whatever lofty ideal he had learned to form of the Divine character and will, inspired his scorn of, and determined severance of himself from the selfishness and depravity—the prostitution of high names to petty purposes, which he saw in priest and people alike, at that period of decadence. Whether we call it a recurrence to the nobler past, or an anticipation of an ideal future, the clear fact remains—the tone of the prophecy, the current of the Prophet's thoughts, are distinctly *different* from the Judaism of his day, as from this and from other points of view we catch glimpses

<sup>1</sup> *Malachi* מַלְאֲכִי = Malachijah, messenger of Jehovah, ἄγγελος Κυρίου. The LXX. render therefore i. 1, 'by the hand of Malachi,' 'by the hand of his angel;' and thence probably the idea, referred to by S. Jerome, that this prophecy was delivered by an angel in human shape. Similarly S. John Baptist, the forerunner or messenger of the Lord, is represented as an angel—(S. Jerome, *Comm. in Mal.* and *in Hag.*, S. Augustine, *De Civit.* c. 36, and comp. Dr. Stanley's note to p. 159.) Corn. à Lapidé in loc. has a most elaborate discussion upon this subject.



of its turbid and discoloured stream. The last utterance of the last Prophet is an aspiration—a *Sursum corda*—an outlook over future ages to descry, if it *might* be so, the approach, however distant, of the ark of the Divine deliverance, floating over the troubled waters of the time.

But it is deplorable to notice how Dr. Stanley twists this—we had almost said *divine*—sadness to the purposes of his party polemic. It was aspiration pure and unmixed, the *consequence* of earthly troubles, indeed, but detached from them almost wholly, that we have seen in the Prophet. But to Dr. Stanley it appears to have been ‘the contrast between the real and the ideal in religious institutions.’ Now it is true that such a contrast was implied in the Prophet’s denunciations, as it is virtually implied in all exhortation. It is none the less true that no such contrast was present to his thought. The serene philosophising which Dr. Stanley, *suo more*, inserts between the lines of the prophecy would have been totally alien to his national habits of thought, and an anachronism to the age in which he lived. For those were as yet and on the whole ages of faith; and an age of faith rarely philosophises. Its people do not sit loose enough to their beliefs to contemplate them from the outside, however imperfectly they may practise those beliefs—which is a very different matter.

The same tendency which leads Dr. Stanley to project his own habits of thought into a distant age and into the minds of a people differing *toto calo* from himself, leads him entirely astray, in our judgment, when he makes the third of the great religious ideas which underlie this prophecy to have been ‘the absolute equality, in the Divine judgment, of all pure and sincere worship throughout the world’—(p. 169.) Whatever may be said for such a doctrine in itself—and we do not intend to discuss it here—it is clear to our mind that the present writing contains no such idea. If the Prophet could say, ‘My name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering,’—how did he suppose the prediction was to be fulfilled? Was it to be by levelling up the Gentile rites to equal acceptance with the Hebrew? Assuredly *not*. The very terms which he employs imply the very reverse, for the incense was that of the daily sacrifice and the offering was the familiar *minchah* מִנְחָה, with which the Jewish priest approached Jehovah; so that what the passage contemplates is really the ultimate triumph and universality of a worship addressed to Jehovah and acceptable to Him, which would be ideally the Jewish worship, in terms of which it was described. The entire

world beholds the prophecy realised in Christianity; and the lecturer's cavil is utterly futile and trifling.

Equally positive and equally mistaken is Dr. Stanley when he speaks of the Book of Esther. 'The name of God is *not* there, but the work of God *is*,' he says; but this is only true in the wider sense in which the whole course of human history is of God. The tenderer *religious* sense is conspicuous by its absence in the Book of Esther; it is the hard, stern, stiffnecked Jewish spirit that gave so much trouble in all ages which is the predominant influence throughout it. Patriotism no doubt; but patriotism hardened and indurated by oppression and wrong, and growing into the fierceness which makes one think of the maxim which we hear of later, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy,' and which, if it must be credited with some elevation above that selfishness which is concentrated solely upon the individual, is even more dangerous because it is the corruption of a higher feeling, and more mischievous because of the pseudo-consecration which it seems to give to the violent passions of the human heart. And to this the Book of Esther itself bears sufficient witness.

This Lecture on Malachi is painful to read. It is startling to find the great thinkers of other ages and other lands, Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, set side by side with the Prophets of Judaism, and even with One greater than they, and this *upon equal terms*; so that either these are denuded of their special inspiration, or those, as by a kind of concurrent endowment, are clothed with the same. But this is a habit which the new and daring science of comparative religion has taught. There may be no real irreverence of purpose in this. More insidious and far more objectionable appears to us the dissertation upon pp. 184-192, in which the origin of the religious ideas embodied in the later Judaic teaching is traced to the influence exercised upon the latter by 'the faith of Zoroaster'—'a faith so pure and venerable as that of the Zendavesta,' and so on. These are represented as having, through Judaism, 'been able, partly as an ally, partly as a foe, to colour the growth of the ritual and the creed' of Christianity. And it is calmly suggested that such elements may be, therefore, 'more contentedly dropped.' And this is said, it will be observed, without giving any details, or specifying the inculcated doctrines, whereby the writer might be brought to book. It is a method of procedure very characteristic of Dr. Stanley, and very often practised in his work. But general statements can only be met by general statements;

it is not possible, as Dr. Newman said of Gibbon, 'to refute a sneer;' and we can only therefore point out in general terms, that the Gnostic elements to which we should suppose Dr. Stanley to be referring (if he does *not* mean these, we are quite at a loss to attach any meaning to what he says), after long trying to establish themselves within the Church, finally failed, and for the most part died out; and that, so far from influencing the development of the Christian dogma, as they undoubtedly tried hard to do, they only succeeded in exciting a wave of reaction and repulsion to the entire Gnostic movement, which carried the Church clear over any possible tendency to rationalise. The suggestion of the lecturer that various doctrines of Christianity itself are due, not to Divine Revelation, but to human contact and influence, is virtually, and whether he intends it or not, a disguised Deism.

We confess to a certain amount of surprise when we turned first to Lecture xlv. and found a chapter on *Socrates* included in the History of the Jewish Church. Any direct connexion between the one and the other—any tangible and measurable influence exercised by Socrates over the development of the later Hebraic thought, there is none that we can see. It is at best a parallel and illustration, and a remote one, of the main subject. Its insertion is in accordance with Dr. Stanley's habit (as it was that of Gibbon) of finding *secondary causes* for the development of great truths. There are in fact two ways of degrading a truth and breaking its evidential force. The one is to deny it flatly; the other is to account for it, to make it a result instead of a cause; and thus to reduce it to the ordinary level. Dr. Stanley does not adopt the first course; but he has very much the appearance of taking the second, in this and in other instances. Christians have hitherto been in the habit of considering that 'life and immortality were brought to light through the Gospel.' But Dr. Stanley suggests that the first germs of the doctrines of immortality and a resurrection came perhaps 'by the contact of Zoroastrianism,' and that we are to seek 'its full outburst in the teaching, if not of Socrates, yet of Socrates' greatest disciple'—(p. 333.) 'In the Dialogue of Socrates in the prison, the conviction of a future existence is urged—whatever may be thought of the arguments—with an impressive earnestness which has left a more permanent mark upon the world'—(p. 226.) And so on throughout the Lecture. It is marvellous to see the change which now comes over Dr. Stanley's treatment of his *subject-matter*. Hitherto he has striven for the *minimum* of the authoritative element in the literature he has been examining. He

has questioned the age and authenticity of book after book. He has suggested mistakes of fact, faults of narrowness, of prejudice, of ignorance. Page after page the tendency of his work has been to *lower*, never to exalt the sacred writers. His suggestions tend uniformly to lead to the conclusion that we owe them less than we thought; that if they learned anything, it was by the use of the same faculties with which we are endowed, and by strictly human processes, common to the whole human race, and open no less to us than to them. But now the scene changes. *Exeunt* the Sacred Writers; enter Socrates; and all the minimizing which we have described is exchanged for the generous and liberal appreciation—we should rather say, *admiration*—of his subject. We have at length reached the true hero of the world-epos;—the real giver of the general impulse 'to the world's progress.' The appearance of Socrates, according to Dr. Stanley, 'exercised an influence over the whole subsequent history of European speculation.' 'He stands at the very fountain-head of philosophical thought.' Even Dr. Stanley's facile rhetoric breaks down under him, and proves inadequate to give utterance to a panegyric so unmeasured and so indiscriminating. Socrates, it is more than hinted, was the real originator of many truths which Christianity has hitherto claimed as her own; and we seem on the very verge of a new devotion, conducted on strictly Aryan principles, in which Socrates shall be the object of such adoration as its adherents shall find it consistent with their own intellectual dignity to pay. In fact it is Socrates and Herod, the one a Greek, the other an Idumæan, neither, therefore, a Jew, who are the real heroes of these 'Lectures on the History of the *Jewish Church*.'

'He no longer stands amongst us. Yet we can fancy what would result were he now to visit the earth—were he once more to appear with that Silenic physiognomy, with that grotesque manner, with that indomitable resolution, with that captivating voice, with that homely humour, with that solemn earnestness, with that siege of questions—among the crowded parties of our metropolis, under the groves and cloisters of our universities, in the midst of our political, our ecclesiastical, our religious meetings, on the floor of our legislative assemblies, at the foot of the pulpits of our well-filled churches. How often in a conversation, in a book, in a debate, in a speech, in a sermon, have we longed for the doors to open and for the son of Sophroniscus to enter—how often, in the heat of angry accusations, in the tempest of pamphlets, in the rabbinical subtleties or in the theological controversies that have darkened counsel by words without knowledge for eighteen centuries and more, in Judaic or Christian times, might souls, weary with unmeaning phrases and undefined

issues, have been tempted to exclaim: "Oh! for one hour of Socrates!" Oh, for one hour of that voice which should, by its searching cross-examination, make men see what they knew and what they did not know—what they meant, and what they only thought they meant—what they believed in truth, and what they only believed in name—wherein they agreed, and wherein they differed! Differences, doubtless, would still remain, but they would be the differences of serious and thinking men, and there would be a cessation of the hollow catchwords and empty shibboleths by which all differences are inflamed and aggravated. The voice of the great cross-examiner himself is indeed silent, but there is a voice in each man's heart and conscience which, if we will, Socrates has taught us to use rightly. That voice, more sacred than the divine monitor of Socrates himself, can still make itself heard; that voice still enjoins us to give to ourselves a reason for the hope that is in us—both hearing and asking questions?—(p. 230.)

For completeness therefore and for sustained enthusiasm, for rich and measured beauty of utterance, this chapter on Socrates is the very cream and flower of the present volume. Only that we are in conscience obliged to acknowledge that it is seriously exaggerated and overstrained; it is a mere *tour de force*, with, as we cannot but think, something of the glee of the discoverer prompting a course of speculation that surely Dr. Stanley, alone among Churchmen, would have cared to follow; and, finally, it has no real organic connexion with the subject of the book, no legitimate place in its narrative at all.

We forbear to notice seriously the absurd stress which is laid upon Socrates as 'a cross-examiner.' Certainly a system of cross-examining, whatever wider sense we put upon the phrase, is not the *panacea* for this world's evils. It may lend itself to evil as readily as to good; elicit falsehood as readily as truth in dexterous hands; and can never rank but as a secondary and subordinate instrument in the search after truth, or rather we should say that its value is confined to the unveiling of falsehood. The cross-examiner *in excelsis* would prick a few wind-bags at most; and the game would hardly be worth the candle. As for affording any sensible help to the world's progress, the thing is out of the question. And,—*risu solvuntur tabulae*,—the court, if we mistake not, will break up amid inextinguishable laughter, as Dr. Stanley, his tact and his sense of humour for once deserting him, gravely concludes, 'a life without cross-examination is no life at all.' Most people would have put the matter altogether the other way.

The account of Alexandria in Lecture xlvii. is introduced with the story of a meeting between Alexander the Great and the Jewish High Priest at Scopus [? Sapha], which is a very

doubtful Talmudic fable, though we must suppose it was so effective a decoration to Dr. Stanley's pages as to be entirely irresistible.<sup>1</sup> When it is appealed to in favour of the earlier date of the Book of Daniel, he demurs to it. But when he requires it to make a picture, he can credit it willingly enough! An effective story never pleads in vain with him for admission. But the incident, be it true or false, is only remotely connected with the subject treated; and like the account (also a very doubtful one) of Alexander's brutal treatment of Batis, the defender of Gaza, which Dr. Stanley relegates to a note,—might with advantage have been omitted altogether. We do not know that there is any fault to be found with his description of the Septuagint. He is rather enthusiastic about it than not; *why*, it is hard to see, unless it be that he considers it one 'which differs far more widely from the original, and is far more deeply imbued with the natural infirmity of translators, than any other version of the Bible that has ever since appeared' (p. 258); which is at all events an *original* reason for preferring it; and the Lectures are *not too* rich in originality. One would almost say that the writer is good-natured and complimentary whenever he is able to claim superiority over the thing he is describing, because of some fault or shortcoming in it, and is stirred to hostility and detraction only when superiority is claimed over him. He has rather strained such scanty evidence as exists in stating positively that the translation 'dragged its slow length along for at least two centuries'—if, as seems probable, and he himself allows, it was commenced in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus II. and had come into common use long before the Christian era.

Lecture xlviii. deals with the History of the Maccabees, and is a succession of those brilliant *tableaux* which form Dr. Stanley's chiefest attraction in some eyes. As usual, the collection of multifarious odds and ends of glittering historical information contains not a few suspicious articles. He follows Ewald (that is almost a matter of course all through the work) in deriving the name Maccabæus from מַכַּבֵּה a hammer, rather than מַכְבִּי, but neither view seems to us satisfactory. An instance of (not unusual) disingenuousness occurs on p. 336, in his treatment of the oft-quoted passage, 2 Macc. xii. 40-45.

<sup>1</sup> When the story that Jaddua showed to Alexander the predictions of his conquests in the Book of Daniel is brought forward to prove its earlier date, Dr. Stanley can calmly say that 'the doubt which rests over the story generally, and the acknowledged incorrectness of some of its details, deprive this allusion of serious weight'—(p. 72.)



That passage, whatever be the amount of authority which it can fairly bear, is clearly and unmistakably an instance of prayer and offering for the dead, and it is, what we have called it, disingenuous to explain the passage, as Dr. Stanley does, so that it shall seem to have been primarily for the benefit of the living. That is unfair; and the unfairness is of a kind that Dr. Stanley permits to himself throughout his work. He would not allow himself, we believe, to falsify his text; but he arrogates to himself an unlimited licence of interpretation. He has but small scruple, as we have noticed more than once, in obtaining an inference which he requires, by violent treatment of the text, or by heightening the details of an historical occurrence in order to complete a picture, or render more apposite an historical parallel.

Who, for example, can doubt, that when narrating the storm of Jerusalem under Pompey, he has improved upon the hint given by Plutarch, and represented the priests as having 'sat immovable in their seats round the temple court,' until slain by their assailants (which is preposterous and improbable), in order to complete the parallel, which his fertile imagination supplied, between them and the legendary Roman senators at the Gaulish sack of Rome? Then, on the following page (404), he cannot refrain from converting an approximate into an exact coincidence of time between Pompey's violent entry into the Holy of Holies in the Temple at Jerusalem and the great day of Atonement—the one day of the whole year upon which the High Priest himself was wont to do so. The fact was, the actual storm took place upon that day, and it would not be until afterwards that Pompey would have time or opportunity deliberately to perpetrate that outrage upon the Temple, for which, as tradition, both Jewish and Christian, has not failed to remark, his sad after fate was a not undeserved Nemesis. Dean Stanley, as might have been expected, defends the irreverence and excuses the doer of it.

Next to the chapter on Socrates, that on Herod is perhaps elaborated the most fully and carefully of all. In the splendid, unscrupulous, though vigorous-minded despot, Dr. Stanley has a congenial subject for his pen. He is very fond of Herod; *all the Sadducees were*. He recalls his horsemanship, his 'splendid presence;' 'his fine black hair, which, when it turned grey, was dyed;' his greatness of soul; his 'deep and strong family affections;' 'his tears of affection for his grandchildren;' his culture, 'his passion for philosophy and history,' 'his philosophic sentiment,' and so on. Upon Herod's portrait the lecturer delights to lavish all his skill; and he is just the



kind of figure, it is only fair to say, upon whom his filigrees of words are capable of being hung with effectiveness and grace. It must be in gratitude for so many pages brightened by the splendid figure of the successful adventurer, that Dr. Stanley systematically heightens the lights and paints away the shadows throughout the elaborate portrait which he draws. Herod's incredible duplicity, alternated with paroxysms of brutal violence, his reckless and far-reaching cruelty, the 'sea of blood' in which he bathed throughout his reign; the murder of his wife, three of his own sons, the aged Hyrcanus, the High Priest and his relative, and hosts of lesser victims—all these things are passed over with slight notice, and certainly are not stigmatised as they should have been. In one instance, after the storming of Jerusalem by the Roman troops, in order to install Herod, we are told 'the noblest parts of Herod's finer nature were called forth. With a spirit worthy of Henry IV. of France, he exclaimed: "The dominion of the whole civilised world would not compensate to me for the destruction of my subjects," and he actually bought off the rapacious Roman soldiers out of his own personal munificence'—(p. 420.)

How noble and generous! exclaims the reader who knows nothing of the facts except what Dr. Stanley records. But when he learns that this noble and clement spirit put to death the whole Sanhedrim, except two persons (*three*, says Dr. Stanley), and that it was out of the property of his victims that he bought off the Roman soldiery, who were ruining his capital by their outrages, he will probably form a different opinion both of the act itself, and of the degree of confidence which can be safely placed in these showy *tableaux*.

All these are upon matters which admit of the rhetorical treatment in which Dr. Stanley is an adept. The real weakness of the book becomes apparent only when we consider the critical element in it. Dr. Stanley is not an authority on Biblical criticism; nor, to do him justice, does he ever pretend to be. But then why does he try to bend the bow of Ulysses? All those questions which meet him in the course of his narrative, and which require close and accurate scholarship for their solution, are here treated, without an exception, cursorily, superficially, and at second hand. On pp. 71, 74, he glides over the question of the date of the Book of Daniel, after an inadequate examination; how inadequate, may be gathered from the fact that he puts aside 'the linguistic arguments, drawn from the nature of the Hebrew or Chaldee

words used, as too minute and too doubtful to be insisted on'<sup>1</sup>—(p. 70.) So after thus neglecting a great part of the arguments for an earlier date for its composition, it is no wonder that his conclusion should be that the arguments 'incline largely to the side of the later date'—(p. 74.) But of what value that conclusion is, our readers will be able to judge. The discussion about the formation of the Jewish Canon under Ezra, though unobjectionable as far as it goes, is timid and inadequate. Better so indeed than dealing in rash assertion resting on insufficient knowledge; but still not in any sense a grappling with the question of (1) what it was that Ezra had before him, and (2) what was the extent to which his editorial function was exercised upon it? For this inquiry the materials are scanty indeed, but they are greater in quantity than perhaps Dr. Stanley is quite aware; and it seems to us quite possible even yet to come to a conclusion on this difficult question, which, equally removed from the rash destructiveness of such writers as Ewald and the timid uncatholic conservatism of the upholders of a verbal inspiration, shall be equally sound and defensible. But laboriously to pursue such an inquiry as that is not Dr. Stanley's *forte*. He is happier when free to expatiate in the airy regions of fancy and sentiment. When forced to give attention to masses of prosaic facts, he is like a bird tied by the leg. He can seize their broader and more picturesque aspects. He will put sometimes the spirit of an age or a century into a sentence. He has an artist's eye for critical periods—for the crisis of a nation's or of an individual's life. But even then one is not sure of him. As often as not he will misread the signs; will put his own views of things into a period or a character from which they are alien, and pass them off as the authentic utterance of the past. Now and then one meets with a passage of genuine insight in his work. Here for example, in his account of Ezra, he has seized the true idea that it was after the Return from the Captivity that the Jews became nationally the People of the Law. But, even here, he does not seem to be aware that this feeling must have grown up during the Captivity, when the Temple was in ruins, when during the exile the functions of the Priest were in abeyance, and the Law was

<sup>1</sup> He passes over Dr. Pusey's great work on the subject with a bare mention, and does not attempt to meet its arguments for the earlier date; indeed he tacitly allows that they are unanswerable by his suggestion that there are earlier Babylonian documents incorporated in the book to which these marks of greater age are to be referred, while yet it is of a later date as a whole. But he does not attempt to point these out—(p. 73.)

the only visible bond of union—a bond that constrained their wills while it united them. But he is right in the main; for this is the first overt act of the newly-born national sentiment:—

‘We feel that in this scene a new element of religion has entered on the stage. The Temple has retired for the moment into the background. There is something which stirs the national sentiment yet more deeply, and which is the object of still more profound veneration. It is “the Law.” However we explain the gradual growth of the Pentateuch, however we account for the ignorance of its contents, for the inattention to its precepts, this is the first distinct introduction of the Mosaic law as the rule of the Jewish community. That lofty platform on which Ezra stood might be fitly called the “seat of Moses.” It is from this time that the Jewish nation became one of those whom Mohammed calls “the people of a book.” It was but one book amongst the many which Nehemiah had collected, but it was the kernel round which the others grew with an ever-multiplying increase. The Bible, and the reading of the Bible as an instrument of instruction, may be said to have been begun on the sunrise of that day when Ezra unrolled the parchment scroll of the Law. It was a new thought that the Divine will could be communicated by a dead literature as well as by a living voice. In the impassioned welcome with which this thought was received lay the germs of all the good and evil which were afterwards to be developed out of it; on the one side, the possibility of appeal in each successive age to the primitive, undying document that should rectify the fluctuations of false tradition and fleeting opinion; on the other hand, the temptation to pay to the letters of the sacred book a worship as idolatrous and as profoundly opposed to its spirit as once had been the veneration paid to the sacred trees or the sacred stones of the consecrated groves or hills’—(p.142.)

This is well enough, and true enough, though it is Dr. Stanley says it; but generalities are only a frothy diet if taken alone. What we desiderate throughout is the honest fronting of facts, and not merely the arranging them into a picturesque narrative, and nothing more. The graceful fooling with them which is Dr. Stanley’s method; mixing together history and legend, fact and hypothesis, to eke out a sentence or complete a picture, seems to us wanting in intellectual—to say nothing of religious—seriousness. In this flounder of silvery mist, of mingled fact and fancy, the truth is indistinguishable; and the effect must be a general levelling of the barriers which separate the sacred and the secular. He may think that the effect would be to raise secular events to the level of what is technically known as ‘sacred;’ we feel but too sure that it would be to reduce the sacred to the level of the secular.

A review of the whole volume suggests to us very grave

reflections. While we gladly acknowledge many excellences in the work, a brilliant style, multifarious knowledge, a remarkable many-sidedness and power of intellectual sympathy with many and different people; we are forced to recognise a looseness of personal hold upon dogmatic expressions of truth, and a systematic depreciation of revelation; and that not so much in direct words and in a controversial way, but by means of incessant suggestion and continual inuendo; and by constantly putting avowed fables on a level with revelation, and so destroying the reader's perception of its pre-eminence. The feeling that has been in our own mind, as we have read and re-read the volume, is that the supernatural as such has vanished altogether from the writer's horizon of thought; that every particle of knowledge respecting heaven and the things beyond this life has been resolved into legend and *Aberglaube*—that the two great Biblical religions, like all others which have had their day on earth, have sprung simply 'from the sacred soil of the human heart,' and have no more come down from heaven than their congeners. Such, we say, is the impression that the book has left upon us; and we say it with great regret. We should rejoice to know and would gladly acknowledge that we had been doing injustice to Dr. Stanley by supposing that the Lectures rightly portray his own view upon these matters. Whether we are right or wrong, we cannot see the supernatural even recognised from the beginning of the book to the end of it. With all their beauty and the high culture which has gone to their composition, they thus utterly, hopelessly, we had almost said *purposefully*, misrepresent the Bible. And there is one most painful suspicion which is forced upon us by this final Lecture especially, to which we give utterance in order that, as we hope, it may bring a disclaimer from Dr. Stanley, of the inference implied. 'What think ye of Christ?' is a question that must necessarily and most properly be asked of a writer, the course of whose narrative has brought him up to the eve of the Incarnation; and if that question were to be asked of Dr. Stanley, these Lectures, at all events, would supply us with no certitude as to what the answer would be.

He exhausts language (as did the Arians) upon the perfections of Jesus *as a man*, but he has not a word to say of His perfections *as God*. He has many periphrases for the name of Jesus,—but he never once calls Him LORD. 'Not a conqueror, not a philosopher, not a mere wonder-working magician'—*nefas dictu!* 'but an innocent child, an humble and inquiring boy, a man who knew what was in man.' . . . 'a homely, social,

yet solitary Being, in whose transcendent goodness and truthfulness there was revealed a new image of the Divine nature, a new idea of human destiny' (p. 471),—that is the most he has to say. 'A Teacher' he calls Him, 'the last and greatest Prophet of the Jewish Church, the first and greatest Prophet of the races of the future.' His birth was 'an event which was but imperfectly understood at the time, which has been but imperfectly understood since.' It seems to him that His 'empire over the intellect and affections has not passed away.' He even goes so far as to speak of Him, in what sense we know not, in the closing lines of his work, as being 'still, for all mankind, the Way, the Truth, and the Life.' We put all these scattered and ambiguous sayings together, and we ask, Is this the Christian faith? It may be reconcilable with the faith. But we are sure that it is not calculated to teach the Christian faith to any who did not know it before. It may be only the writer's peculiar idiosyncrasy and recoil from the ordinary expressions of belief that cause him to utter himself in these imperfect and halting phrases. It may be so; and we trust it is. But surely the Church of England has the right to ask more than this of one, not the least highly placed among her dignitaries, more, we say, than that his publications on religious subjects should be just capable of being reconciled, by charitable constructions and large allowance, with the faith which she professes at her altars and has embodied in her creeds.

It would be useless to disguise the fact that publications of the character of this volume are a cause of grave anxiety and regret to those who wish well to the Church of England; nay, further, to the still wider circle of all those who hold dear the faith of Christ, and do not desire to see it replaced by a nebulous and shifting religious sentiment, powerless to transform the evil heart of man or to control his actions. Into what final outburst of mellifluous rhetoric, covering ambiguous doctrinal statements which distress believers and can only delight the infidel, Dr. Stanley's reference in his Preface to a 'yet greater task' may rise and culminate, it is impossible to say, and we can only anxiously conjecture. The best that we could wish is that the series should end here.

---

## ART. II.—HENRY THE EIGHTH'S DIVORCE.

*Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII., preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere in England.* Arranged and catalogued by J. S. BREWER, M.A., under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, and with the sanction of Her Majesty's Secretaries of State. Vol. IV. Introduction and Appendix. (London : Longmans, 1875.)

THE publications issued under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, and especially the large green volumes of Calendars of State Papers, are certainly destined to create a revolution in the study of English history. Twenty years ago no one had any idea of the immense mass of original correspondence which lay unused and unusable in the State Paper Office. No handbooks or digests of any kind informed the public what was to be found there, and all access to the papers themselves was clogged with the most inconvenient and troublesome restrictions. Thanks to the late Lord Romilly, this state of things has passed away. Access to our national archives is now as free as can be desired, and volumes upon volumes have been and are still being published, full of condensed summaries of the contents of the papers, which are in some cases so clear and so exhaustive that a very good notion of our diplomatic history may be obtained from the perusal of these summaries alone.

But on no period of English history have these researches thrown so much light as on the reign of Henry VIII., in which, for very good reasons, it was found necessary to adopt a more comprehensive plan than that generally followed in these publications. Professor Brewer, to whom this important era has been entrusted, was commissioned to catalogue not only the papers in the Record Office, but also those in the British Museum and other places, wherever original letters could be found, and to catalogue them all in one chronological series. By this means the scattered fragments of a vast correspondence have been brought together: letters in the Cottonian Library are read in true sequence with letters in the Record Office to which they are the answers; undated letters

are placed in their proper years according to internal evidence ; and the whole progress of public affairs, as chronicled from day to day by many and various writers, is for the first time made clear and legible.

Mr. Brewer's first volume was published in 1862. It contained the papers of the first six years of Henry's reign in a thick octavo of nearly 1,200 pages and over a hundred pages of Introduction. Volumes ii. and iii. have since been published, each in two parts, with still longer Introductions. And now we have volume iv., in three parts, with an Introduction of 666 pages, published by itself as a separate volume. This completes the history of the reign to the death of Wolsey. The work has been necessarily slow, owing to the enormous mass of materials that had to be dealt with ; but the results were well worth waiting for. These results, as far as general history is concerned, are stated with remarkable lucidity by Mr. Brewer himself in his very valuable Introductions ; and we have but to follow their guidance, referring from them, as we please, to the documents in the calendar itself, to feel assured that the history of the reign now rests upon a more solid basis than it ever did before.

The period embraced in vol. iv. and in the Introduction before us is perhaps the most interesting portion of Henry's reign. It contains, besides other events of the highest magnitude, the story of the fall of Wolsey, and of the rise of Anne Boleyn. Of the causes which led to the English Reformation, many are to be looked for in secret proceedings and in despatches and negotiations, a considerable number of which have never seen the light till now. Protestant and Roman Catholic must henceforth lay aside their theological weapons and be content to judge the case of England, at least, upon its own merits, and not by any preconceived ecclesiastical theories. For the whole controversy turns, after all, on historical facts, and there is much in the undeniable history of the case to rebuke the prejudices that have prevailed on both sides. Henceforth, however, we may indulge some little hope that men will no longer suffer their views in religion to be bound up with untenable theories on plain matters of fact. No service can be done to truth by attempting to conceal the animal nature or apologise for the crimes of Henry VIII. ; nor, on the other hand, can it be of the slightest use to attribute the Reformation to causes altogether independent of the King's imperious will. If the position of the Church of England as an exponent of divine truth cannot be vindicated without having recourse to such theories, the day must be



surely near at hand when that Church will have lost its hold upon honest and truth-loving people.

The real history of the breach with Rome has only to be set forth clearly to show that, whatever we may think of the conduct of leading persons, the separation was not only justifiable in itself, but a matter of positive necessity from which there was no escape. But to explain how this was so, we must endeavour first to realise to ourselves the relations of Church and State as they were in the days of Wolsey's administration.

Theoretically regarded, a Cardinal and Legate of the Apostolic See, living in England and acting as chief adviser to the King, was an anomaly that should not have been tolerated. No man can serve two masters, and if the Legate did his duty to the See of Rome, he could not be a single-minded servant of the State. The difficulty had been felt in the preceding century, in the case of Cardinal Beaufort, who on his acceptance of that dignity was for a time excluded from his seat at the Council board, and threatened with deprivation of the revenues of his bishopric besides. But the case of Beaufort had also made it clear that, however incompatible the two positions naturally were, no inconvenience could arise from it to a strong nationality like England. The Prince of the Church, in the interests of his own nation, had no scruple in turning a crusade against the Hussites into an expedition against Joan of Arc. The days when Rome was formidable as a foreign power had already passed away, and whatever functions or dignities she might bestow upon an English subject were only so many concessions which she must expect to see turned to a political account in the interests, not of the Church, but of the kingdom.

On the other hand, the communication which the higher clergy naturally maintained with Rome, the centre of Christendom, was in itself a great means of qualifying them for the service of the State. It was the clergy among whom Henry VII. selected his chief advisers; it was the clergy more than others that were sent on foreign missions requiring diplomatic skill and tact. Other envoys were often little more than ornamental figures at the courts of foreign princes, useful, no doubt, in preserving friendly relations, and by their stately bearing and profuse hospitality maintaining what was due to the dignity of their king and country. But wherever delicate work was to be done,—where knight, or earl, or illiterate duke was deceived by the potentate to whom he was accredited, and perhaps betrayed by his clumsiness the secrets

of his mission,—it was the humble ecclesiastic or untitled scholar who saw through the blandishments of diplomacy and statecraft, counteracting sometimes the mischief that would otherwise have been done by men of less attainments and higher position than himself. By education, by experience, by the encouragement and hope of high promotion which the Church alone offered to men of natural ability, the clergy were the men who understood human nature best and developed the largest amount of worldly wisdom.

Wolsey was but the last in a succession of clerical advisers—his chief predecessors being Alcock, Morton, and Fox, Bishop of Winchester—who had guided or taken a leading part in the counsels of their sovereign. But it was not always of their own seeking that men like these were placed to administer the affairs of the State instead of those of the Church. The antagonism between the two sets of duties was felt by all, and to a very conscientious bishop, like Fox, it was the greatest blessing to be allowed to quit the Council board in old age and spend the rest of his life in a more befitting manner by attending to his diocese. Nay, Wolsey himself, however much he may have enjoyed the height of power and the intrigues of State, was, probably, not without a feeling of satisfaction when, as he is represented in the play, he told Cromwell that “the king had cured him” by stripping him of his honours and the chancellorship. It was then that he could look back upon a busy life spent amid the turmoil and glories of this world, and regret that so devoted a service had not been given to God instead of to a sovereign who had ungratefully cast him off, and left him naked to his enemies. As a matter of fact, his old servant Cromwell wrote to him, as one who might presume he knew his mind: ‘Your grace being as ye are, I suppose ye would not be as ye were to win a hundred times as much as ever ye were possessed of.’ And it is also a fact that he retired to his diocese of York, which he had never been able to visit before, and won for himself there the highest popularity by the manner in which he discharged his spiritual duties.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ‘Who was less beloved,’ asks the writer of a pamphlet, entitled *A Remedy for Sedition*, published six years after Wolsey’s death,—‘Who was less beloved in the North than my Lord Cardinal, God have his soul, before he was amongst them? Who better beloved, after he had been there awhile? We hate oftentimes whom we have good cause to love. It is a wonder to see how they were turned; how of utter enemies they became his dear friends. He gave bishops a right good example how they might win men’s hearts. There was few holy days but he would ride five or six mile from his house, now to this parish church, now to that, and there

But it was only when released by his sovereign from the high responsibilities of State that Wolsey could do his duties as a bishop at all. For fifteen or sixteen years his advice had been continually required by Henry on all matters, foreign and domestic, which naturally came before the Council; and his abilities were so clearly acknowledged, that the aid of other councillors was dispensed with. Gifted with a genius for State affairs, which he had the satisfaction of knowing was thoroughly appreciated by a most intelligent master, he devoted himself to Henry's service as the main business of his life. To serve such a king was a privilege, though it might be a bondage. The thought of serving one's country may give happiness, and Wolsey was a thorough Englishman; but services rendered to one's country often pass unheeded and unknown. The charm of serving a king like Henry VIII., ungrateful as he showed himself in the end, arose from the personal interest which he exhibited in what was done for him. The very fire and vigour of his character had in it something fascinating and attractive. He was a king of strong nature altogether,—strong in judgment, strong in passion, strong in will and determination, strong in limb and muscle. When not carried away by some lawless passion, no one could be more discriminating; and yet even in his passions he took counsel of reason, and tried hard to persuade himself and the world that he was governed entirely by arguments derived from law and conscience.

Such was the master Wolsey had to deal with; and in estimating the part played by the Cardinal in history, it is very necessary to keep in view the position in which he was placed. It is quite a mistake to suppose, as is often done, that the King ever put the reins into his hands and took no thought of what was done in his own name. Not a single step was taken, even in matters of subordinate importance, 'without the privity o' the King,' however agreeable it may have been to Wolsey's enemies to impute to him this audacity. That he had very great influence with Henry there is no doubt at all; he was the only man who ever had,

cause one or other of his doctors to make a sermon into the people. He sat amongst them and said mass before all the parish. He saw why churches were made. He began to restore them to their right and proper use. He brought his dinner with him, and bade divers of the parish to it. He inquired whether there was any debate or grudge between any of them; if there were, after dinner he sent for the parties to the church and made them all one. Men say well that do well. God's laws shall never be so set by as they ought, before they be well known.—Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey*, i. 252 (Singer's edition).

in political affairs. But even he never ventured to oppose directly anything that the King had once taken into his head. When he carried his point it was by seeming to yield everything, acquiescing thoroughly in the King's expressed desires, and offering merely his own suggestions as to the best mode of carrying them out. The rock on which his authority ultimately split—the weight that pulled him down, as he himself expresses it in the play,<sup>1</sup>—was nothing but the King's unreasonable determination to make Anne Boleyn his wife, whether the Church could be got to clear the way for him or no.

It is said by Cavendish, that when Henry first declared his wishes on this subject to the Cardinal, the latter fell upon his knees and entreated him to change his purpose. But Henry's mind, when once it was made up, was perfectly inflexible. 'I assure you,' said Wolsey himself to Sir William Kingston, 'I have often kneeled before him in his privy chamber, on my knees, the space of an hour or two, to persuade him from his will and appetite; but I could never bring to pass to dissuade him therefrom.' For fifteen years the Cardinal had been the obedient servant of the King's pleasure, continually planning and contriving how to give effect to his desires. But this was a desire to which he could not possibly give effect—not, it must be owned, by reason of a too scrupulous conscience, for he was willing to go all lengths even in a thing like this if it had been really practicable after all. But it was simply hopeless that it could be done at all, at least through the instrumentality of the Cardinal. Before the wished-for end could be attained, the authority which had made him a Cardinal would have to be set aside; and his power to serve the King, for good or evil, would have come to an end.

At what exact date this insane passion began, and what form it originally took in the King's mind, we are without precise means of judging. But there are various indications from which we may form a pretty tolerable surmise of what was going on at various periods. From the King's own words to Grynæus in 1531, it would seem that he had ceased to cohabit with Catherine for seven years; so that his alienation from her must have been decided even at as early a date as 1524. This may, no doubt, have been antecedent to any particular feeling for Anne Boleyn; but Anne had returned from France on the breaking out of war with that country

<sup>1</sup> Shakspeare's *Henry VIII.* act iii. sc. 2.

in 1522, and there is tolerably good evidence that she attracted much attention at the court very soon after her return. Among other admirers—as we know from Cavendish—she succeeded in fascinating Lord Henry Percy, the son and heir of the Earl of Northumberland, and the intimacy had advanced so far that there was believed to be a pre-contract of marriage between them. The rumour seems to have been inaccurate, for it was expressly denied by Percy himself upon oath many years afterwards; but it alarmed the King, who caused the Cardinal to get the match broken off. The old Earl of Northumberland was sent for, and in presence of Cavendish and others of Wolsey's household, upbraided his son for his presumption, and threatened to disinherit him. Soon after he was actually married to the Lady Mary Talbot, daughter of the Earl of Shrewsbury, to the great displeasure of Anne Boleyn, who accordingly hated the Cardinal for his interference, not seeing what the King's designs were.<sup>1</sup>

Now we have distinct evidence that Lord Henry Percy was engaged to the Lady Mary Talbot as early as September 1523, and as he was employed by the King upon the borders of Scotland during the preceding winter and spring,<sup>2</sup> it seems almost certain that his intercourse with Anne Boleyn took place in 1522, the very year that she returned from France. Moreover, it was precisely at this period that court favours began to be showered upon her father, Sir Thomas, in more especial abundance. On April 24, 1522, he was made treasurer of the royal household, and had a grant of the manor of Fobbing in Essex; five days later he was made steward of Tunbridge, master of the hunt there, constable of the Castle, and chamberlain of Tunbridge, receiver and bailiff of Brasted and keeper of the manor of Penshurst. These appointments were followed up by others in 1523 and 1524, and in 1525 he was created Viscount Rochford. In 1529 he was made Earl of Wiltshire and Ormond and Lord Privy Seal.

It is probable, therefore, that even as early as the year 1522, just after her return from France, and when she was only fifteen years of age, Anne Boleyn had begun to exercise some kind of fascination over Henry. It would however, be too much to affirm that he then thought of making her his

<sup>1</sup> Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey* (Singer's edition), i. 57-65.

<sup>2</sup> He was made Warden of the East and Middle Marches in the room of Lord Roos in October 1522. See Brewer, vol. iii. Nos. 2536-7, 2636. And in September 1523, the Earl of Surrey expresses a hope that Percy may succeed him in command as Lieutenant of the North (No. 3321).

queen. He had been, as there is strong reason to believe, too intimate with at least one member of her family already ; and report said, not with her sister only, but with her mother also. She herself was a lively, sparkling coquette, accepting attentions from a considerable circle of admirers, married and unmarried, for the court of Henry VIII. was by no means a model of purity, and idle gallantries were much in fashion. Sir Thomas Wyatt, the poet, a married man, expressed his devotion to her by stealing a small jewel from her person in conversation and wearing it about his neck ; while the King, about the same time, took from her a ring and wore it on his little finger. So at least we are informed by Wyatt's grandson, in a brief memoir of Anne Boleyn, written with a view to vindicate her memory, and not intended, we may presume, to asperse that of the writer's ancestor. The rivalry of the knight and his sovereign is still further exhibited in a passage which we may as well quote in George Wyatt's own words :—

‘ Within a few days after, it happened that the King, sporting himself at bowls, had in his company (as it falls out) divers noblemen and other courtiers of account, amongst whom might be the Duke of Suffolk, Sir F. Brian, and Sir T. Wiat ; himself being more than ordinarily pleasantly disposed, and in his game taking an occasion to affirm a cast to be his that plainly appeared to be otherwise ; those on the other side said, with his grace's leave they thought not ; and yet, still pointing with his finger whereon he wore her ring, replied often it was his, and especially to the knight he said, “ Wiat, I tell thee it is mine,” smiling upon him withal. Sir Thomas, at the length, casting his eye upon the King's finger, perceived that the King meant the lady whose ring that was, which he well knew, and pausing a little, and finding the King bent to pleasure, after the words repeated again by the King, the knight replied, “ And if it maylike your Majesty to give me leave to measure it, I hope it will be mine ; ” and withal took from his neck the lace whereat hung the tablet, and therewith stooped to measure the cast ; which the King espying knew, and had seen her wear, and therewith spurned away the bowl, and said, “ It may be so, but then am I deceived ; ” and so broke up the game.’

Now let us give Anne Boleyn all the credit that the writer of this narrative claims for her at the expense of his ancestor. Wyatt, it seems, stole the jewel from her against her own will, and refused to give it up to her in spite of repeated entreaties. On this point she completely satisfied the King, who was greatly put out by the incident, that she had given him no encouragement. Let us admit further, what we have no doubt is perfectly true, that she preserved



her personal honour, even from the King, at least until he was fully committed to the course of making her his queen. Still, what were the poor girl's surroundings, and what sort of a court was this, in which King and courtiers strove together for the good graces of a young coquette?

Anne Boleyn was certainly not the Protestant saint that the popular imagination loves to represent her. Protestantism, indeed, was so much concerned to maintain the validity of her marriage and the legitimacy of her daughter's birth that under Queen Elizabeth much was said in her behalf that can scarcely be reconciled with the view we derive from contemporary documents. But in truth there is little reason for supposing her to have been a Protestant at all, and still less for regarding her as a saint. To a girl possessed of much strength of character—especially if endowed with high personal attractions—the atmosphere of such a court as that of Henry VIII. must have been simply intolerable. Even the fantastic admiration of a courtly poet like Wyatt could not have been acceptable to a truly religious woman. But poets might be regarded as privileged persons, licensed to pine away in verse under a consuming passion for ideal mistresses, or to address artistic compliments to real beauties, apart altogether from genuine sentiment or existing family ties. So much, however, cannot be said of the men who formed at this time the chief companions of Henry VIII., and most of whom were connected with the Boleyn family. There was Sir William Compton, who had been cited in the Ecclesiastical Court for living in open adultery with a married woman. There were also the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, neither of whom could be held up as a pattern of conjugal fidelity. There were Anne Boleyn's brother George, and Sir Henry Norris, who perished along with her on the scaffold, and her cousin, Sir Francis Bryan, of notoriously dissolute habits, the chief minister of the King's amusements.

We may imagine, then, with what sort of a flame the King first burned in his devotion to this young beauty. Her personal charms struck different observers differently, but all were impressed with her dark complexion, her black eyes, and her long black hair, which she allowed to fall loose down her back, so that Cranmer describes her as sitting *in* it at her coronation. That the King was fascinated with her from the first, even on her return from France in 1522, we have already given our reasons for believing. But if so, either from high principle, or from prudence, she certainly so repelled his advances for a considerable time, as at length to induce a

change in the character of the King's intentions. Of the love-letters that passed between them we have only those written by Henry, but there are indications in some of them that she preferred the position of his servant to that of his mistress. And having already had a prospect of becoming a countess, which was only defeated by the King himself, she was not inclined to throw away her chances of an honourable marriage by yielding too easily to the King's dishonest overtures.

It is unfortunate that we cannot tell the dates of these epistles, nor even the order in which they were written. One thing only is certain, that they were not written in the order in which they are numbered. Mr. Brewer has attempted as far as possible to chronologise them by internal evidence; but even he can do no more in some cases than insert groups of two or three of them together where something like a relative date may be imagined from the expressions used, warning the student in his introduction that this arrangement is one of mere convenience, and leaving him to draw his own conclusions. Thus four of them are placed together after a letter of Wolsey's to the King, dated July 1, 1527; although Mr. Brewer himself informs us<sup>1</sup> he believes them to be of an earlier year. This conviction we also share, especially with regard to the first two; and we are inclined to think that the second was earlier than the first. But the first is the most important letter in the whole collection; for in it the King declares that he had 'been more than a year wounded by the dart of love,' and offers to make Anne his sole mistress and remove all others from his affection if she will but give herself up to him, body and heart.

It is certain from the contents of this letter itself that it was not the first that had passed between them; but the offer which it contained was more explicit, and the demand made by Henry on her affection was pressed as it had never been pressed before. He desired to know expressly her intention touching the love between them, for it evidently did not suit his purpose to be perpetually weaving compliments and contending with her poetical admirers in idle gallantries which led to nothing practical. He had been a whole year and more seriously in love, and he was determined, at whatever cost, to have his way. If by flattery and compliments, by abject submission to a flirt, by grovelling at the feet of his own subject, he, the strong man, the imperious despot, could not obtain his desire, it would have been a check and a disap-

<sup>1</sup> *Introd.* p. ccclxxx. note 2.

pointment such as he never in his life experienced. Anne felt her power over him and she used it to the uttermost.

Now when did the matter come to such a decided crisis as this letter indicates? If we are right in supposing the King to have been first fascinated with Anne Boleyn in 1522, the letter would seem to have been written in the course of the following year. But it is difficult to assign it to so very early a date with any degree of confidence.<sup>1</sup> The King's thoughts, perhaps, did not go back to the breaking off of the match with Lord Percy when he vaguely dated the commencement of his love at more than a year before the time at which he wrote. Moreover, as it would seem from Cavendish's account of the matter that he had not at that time let Anne herself perceive what interest he took in her, he may not have wished afterwards to confess to her the whole extent of his folly.

But if we suppose—as most people probably will—that it was Anne Boleyn's answer to this letter that set the King thinking how he might devise means to put away his queen, there is good ground for believing that it cannot be later than the year 1525 or the spring of 1526. How long he brooded over such a design before taking counsel of others how to carry it into effect can only be a matter of conjecture; but in the year 1526 we find evidence that secret steps had been already taken to obtain a divorce at Rome. In September of that year Clerk, Bishop of Bath, who had lately been ambassador with the Pope, writes to Wolsey from France of certain matters he had been instructed to break to the Pope's confidential minister, Sanga, who had just arrived there. Most of these matters, Clerk was of opinion, would be perfectly practicable; but there was one exception. There would be great difficulty, he wrote, '*circa istud benedictum divortium; reliqua omnia sunt clara.*' That the divorce alluded to was the King's there can be no question, for no other cause could have been pressed in such a manner, and in no other suit was the Pope likely to show himself unmanageable. Moreover, there are references to the matter in the following year which prove that it had by that time been for some time in treaty.

<sup>1</sup> One point, however, about the chronology of the letters is quite clear. The earlier ones are all written in French, and it was only in the course of the year 1528 that the King began to write to her in English. Anne Boleyn, on her return from France, no doubt spoke the language admirably (and it was an acquisition highly cultivated at court), though she showed herself singularly incapable of *spelling* it, as appears by the extraordinary letter to her father first published by Ellis, and reprinted by Mr. Brewer at the beginning of his fourth volume, after careful collation with the original manuscript.

But in point of fact the project may be traced a whole year further back. For even in October 1525 we find Wolsey breathing into the ear of the French ambassador some portentous secret of State—a secret far too weighty and too dangerous to be committed to writing, and which Wolsey made him promise not to mention even in his confidential despatches to his own court. It had evidently some bearing on the new-made peace with France and an alliance against the Emperor.<sup>1</sup> It could scarcely have been anything else than the King's intention of seeking a divorce. And if so, the letter offering to make Anne his sole mistress was written some time before the autumn of 1525. Why not in 1524, the year in which, as we have seen, he must, according to his own account, have deserted Queen Catherine's bed?

No doubt it is a conceivable thing,—and authority may be adduced in favour of such a view—that the King's desire for a divorce arose from feelings, religious, political or personal, which grew up in his mind quite apart from the love of Anne Boleyn, and before he came under her influence. It was first alleged by Tyndall, and after him repeated by Roper and many other writers, that Wolsey had begun the matter by instigating Longland, the King's confessor, 'to put a scruple into his grace's head' about the legality of his marriage with his brother's wife. So, too, in Shakspeare, Queen Catherine directly charges the Cardinal at the trial with having 'blown this coal' between her lord and her. And, as a matter of fact, the imputation had been laid at the Cardinal's door even before that occasion, for Wolsey felt it necessary to take notice of it, and call upon the King to exculpate him, which he did in open court. 'My Lord Cardinal,' Henry replied to him, 'I can well excuse you herein. Marry,' quoth he, 'ye have been rather against me in attempting or setting forth thereof.' The declaration might not amount to much in the way of evidence, for the King was clearly interested in preserving the appearance of impartiality in the tribunal before which he had himself consented to appear; but there is very good reason to believe that he asserted no more than the truth.

To suppose, indeed, that either Wolsey, Longland, or any one else would have dared to suggest this 'scruple' to Henry VIII., unless he had very good evidence beforehand that it would be acceptable to the King himself, implies a view of Henry's character which it is extremely difficult

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar*, vol. iv. No. 1729.

to reconcile with the notorious facts of history. Even those who blamed Wolsey as the author of the scruple could only have regarded him as the panderer to an evil passion, to which, though excusable enough in a King, it was not a subject's duty to minister. For the constitutional theory that the king can do no wrong and his ministers must bear the blame, was quite as old as the days of Henry VIII.,—a good deal older, in fact, than the conditions of constitutional government which justify it. And this was certainly not the only thing in which Wolsey had to endure opprobrium for acts which were really not his own but those of the King himself. As for the King's confessor, it is not to be believed that even he could have felt it a duty of his own mere motion to tax Henry with living in sin after he had been many years married to his brother's widow under what was considered at the time a sufficient Papal dispensation. Indeed it is reported by Harpsfield, on the authority of Bishop Longland's own chaplain, that the bishop himself maintained strongly that the fact was just the other way. It was the King who opened the subject to his confessor, 'and never left urging him until he had won him to give his consent.'<sup>1</sup>

Neither was the scruple in itself such a new thing that it should have required putting into the King's head at all, except by way of reminder. Henry VII. had felt or professed to feel it when the marriage was yet unsolemnised;<sup>2</sup> for though Henry VII. himself proposed it to Ferdinand of Spain, he hung back on various pretexts, of which this was one, and it never was actually solemnised until after his death. The only thing in the scruple that was new was the impugning an accomplished fact and the validity of the Papal dispensation. But even this was not so audacious a conception as it may perhaps appear to the modern imagination. The sanctity of marriage was in those days ill appreciated. The dispensing power of the Pope had been abused to legalise unions even of aunts and nephews. Pre-contracts, long kept secret, were admitted as sufficient pleas to annul marriages which had passed as valid for years. Divorces were often granted on the most scandalous and frivolous pretexts. Henry VIII.'s favourite,

<sup>1</sup> Harpsfield's *Narrative of the Divorce*, 6. Lately edited by Lord Acton.

<sup>2</sup> The Portuguese Ambassador in England wrote, on October 10, 1505, that Henry VII. was secretly negotiating a marriage for his son Henry with the eldest daughter of Philip of Castile, and that the match with the Infanta Catherine would be undone, 'because it weighed much on his conscience'—(*por que hò ha por muyto carrego de comejemcia*).—Gairdner's *Letters of Ric. III. and Hen. VII.*, ii. 147.

the Duke of Suffolk, had actually a wife living when he married the King's sister Mary, and years afterwards he obtained a bull from Clement VII. to prevent objections being raised on this score to the legitimacy of his children. To that previous wife, moreover, he had been first only betrothed, when he married a second lady, whom he afterwards divorced on the ground of the pre-contract, and was wedded to the lady whom he had deserted. Henry's sister, Margaret of Scotland, obtained a divorce from Angus, on an absurd pretence that her previous husband, James IV., might have survived the battle of Flodden and been alive at the time she married him; and being thus set free she took a third husband more to her taste. If Catherine of Arragon had but consented to be set aside or would have forborne her opposition to Henry's suit, there was nothing in the plea which he set up for a divorce which would have shocked the prejudices of the age.

Another account of the way the matter originated, although officially set forth at the time, is equally untenable. A great embassy, with the Bishop of Tarbes at its head, came from France in the beginning of the year 1527, to demand a new alliance with England, to be cemented by the marriage of the Princess Mary either to King Francis himself or to his son the Duke of Orleans. This marriage had been purposely offered to Francis in order to prevent him from binding himself too closely to the Emperor. But it was said that the Bishop of Tarbes, or some other member of the embassy, moved a doubt of the Princess Mary's legitimacy; on which account, it is intimated by Hall the chronicler that the negotiations were suspended. His information was altogether wrong, for the marriage treaty was concluded. The report that the French had raised a doubt of the Princess's legitimacy was a pure political fiction; unless, indeed, as is barely possible, one of the ambassadors was instructed in closest secrecy to inquire whether the dead secret of 1525 had developed any further. If so, it is clear he must have been met by a false assurance that the affair was at an end, and that the King had not the slightest intention of seeking a divorce or casting a doubt upon his daughter's legitimacy. But it so happens that we have a very complete account of the negotiations of this embassy with all their conferences and discussions with Wolsey, and nothing of the kind seems to have been ever mooted. Under any circumstances it is certain, from what we have already shown, that the King had been pursuing the project of a divorce for a long time before the Bishop of Tarbes came to England, so that this could not



possibly have been the cause by which the 'scrupulosity of his conscience' was first awakened to activity.

The thing had been kept a very close secret indeed. Although the King had deserted her bed, it was long before Catherine herself could have suspected the diabolical web of policy that her husband was weaving to dishonour her. She had seen, indeed, with ill-suppressed indignation the highest honours showered upon the King's natural son, whom at the age of six he created Duke of Richmond and Lord High Admiral, and to whom he assigned a household more splendid than that of the Princess Mary. It was clear that the King intended his illegitimate issue, being a boy, to take precedence of Catherine's daughter. But that, at least, was done aboveboard and in the light of day. The effort made at Rome in 1526 to procure a divorce from her was a thing of which it was not intended that she should have the slightest knowledge. And when the attempt to do so there was found to be utterly hopeless, the scheme was persisted in at home in the same clandestine fashion.

In May 1527 the King—of course by his own consent—was summoned to appear before Wolsey as Papal Legate at his house in Westminster to vindicate himself against the charge of having outraged morality by living for eighteen years with his brother Arthur's widow as if she was his lawful wife. The Cardinal, accompanied, we are sorry to say, by Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, had previously visited the King at Greenwich, and the two prelates asked if it would be agreeable to his Majesty, as the matter concerned his spiritual welfare, to allow the case to be tried before them. The King agreed, and Wolsey, sitting in court, declared to him the nature of the indictment. It was notorious to all the world how long he had lived with Catherine, and though he had been married to her by a Papal dispensation, serious doubts had been cast on its validity. It was therefore thought the King should entertain scruples of conscience on the subject, and dread the punishment of the Almighty, which, though slow at times, was commonly severe in proportion to the delay of its infliction. Accordingly he called upon the King to state what he had to say in his own justification. The King read a reply from a written paper, and asked leave to name a proctor in further proceedings. The court was adjourned till May 20, when the King's proctor put in a justification admitting the marriage and the impediment. Objections were raised to the defence set up, and, as the case was declared to be very difficult, time was taken to obtain the opinion of learned divines

and lawyers, among whom it was proposed to consult the Bishops of Rochester, Lincoln, and London.

Of this extraordinary judicial farce historians have been hitherto in utter ignorance. The proceedings were carried on with the strictest secrecy, and nothing was known of them till it fell to Mr. Brewer's lot to decipher the whole story from a defaced and mutilated record. Of course it was intended in the end to have given judgment against the King, commanding him to put away Catherine as not being his lawful wife. For the sake of appearances only, some opinions were to be obtained in answer to questions skilfully drawn up, which might form a plausible justification of the sentence; but the ultimate issue was a foregone conclusion. The proceedings, however, were not resumed. Mr. Brewer suggests several reasons why they may have been dropped, but has omitted to mention one, which appears to us the most obvious. With all the care taken to ensure secrecy, some hint of what was doing had reached the Queen within less than a month of the prorogation of the case. As soon as she heard it she went straight to the King and poured forth her displeasure openly, with all the eloquence of a sorely injured woman, charging the Cardinal with having instigated a divorce between her and Henry.<sup>1</sup> Nor was this all. It was clear she had the sympathy of some who had more or less acquaintance with law; for she demanded counsel, both of Englishmen and aliens—a thing which it could never have occurred to her to claim as a right unless she had been instructed in her rights by others.<sup>2</sup>

Her discovery of the plot disconcerted the conspirators. It not only destroyed their plan of operations, but created suspicion among themselves. The King, indeed, could hardly have imagined that Wolsey himself had revealed the secret to Catherine; but he now saw, or thought he saw, in the Cardinal's suggestions a desire to make him give up the game, or dispose of the matter by a side wind. A new objection had started up, raised by the Queen herself. The plea that there was any affinity between her and Henry before marriage was denied. The previous marriage with Arthur, she said, had never been consummated and was therefore no real marriage at all. This argument the King wished to meet by a direct denial of the statement, and by collecting hearsay evidence to the contrary from those who were about the Prince's bedchamber at the time. Wolsey more wisely

<sup>1</sup> No. 3231.

<sup>2</sup> No. 3217.

suggested that this indelicate subject should be let alone. The King, he said, might better rest his plea on the indisputable fact that she was married to Arthur *in facie ecclesie* and contracted *per verba de presenti*. This itself created an *impedimentum publicæ honestatis* quite as sufficient for invalidating the second marriage as affinity could be, especially as the bull made no express mention of such an impediment, and therefore could not be said to have removed it.

The advice thus given was either misapprehended by the King or was unacceptable, and Wolsey wrote again to explain his meaning. His enemies, who sought his ruin, used every art to persuade Henry that the Cardinal was not really in earnest in seeking to promote his divorce, and the attempt which he had once made (if Cavendish's report be true) to dissuade him from pursuing the matter, must have made the King all the more jealous of any attempt to frustrate his intention. To Wolsey this was unendurable; for well he knew that if once the suspicion was confirmed, his life would fall a sacrifice to the King's indignation. It was not a mere question of being driven from power; the means would be found, assuredly, to bring him to the block. 'At the reverence of God, Sir,' he wrote, 'and most humbly prostrate at your feet, I beseech your grace, *whatsoever report shall be made unto the same*, to conceive none opinion of me but that in this matter, and in all other things that may touch your honour and surety, I shall be as constant as any living creature, not letting (stopping) for any danger, obloquy, displeasure or persecution. Yea, and if all men did fail and swerve, your highness shall find me fast and constant, according to my most bounden duty, assuredly trusting that your highness, of your high virtue, will defend the cause of your most humble servant and subject against all those that will anything speak or allege to the contrary.'

How far the King was satisfied with this explanation of his minister's motives, it would be difficult to say; but, for the present Wolsey's services were indispensable. The Queen's demand to be allowed the aid of counsel was one which could not be easily refused; yet, if granted, as Wolsey significantly remarked, she would get 'all the counsel of the world,' France only excepted, to take her part. Means must be adopted to cajole and to temporise, while cutting off all communication between Catherine and the Imperial Court, until the King had settled the matter at Rome to his own satisfaction. Wolsey, therefore, advised the King, in his own interest, to treat his victim gently for a time, till it was seen what could be got out

of the Pope, and till they were sure that the new alliance with France was so firmly knit that they should have less reason to dread the Emperor's hostility.

What could they expect to get from Rome? Under ordinary circumstances, surely, not very much. But the circumstances were not ordinary. For the Pope was, at that time, a prisoner in the Castle of St. Angelo. Rome had been sacked by the Imperial troops under circumstances of peculiar treachery. The Pope, the Cardinals, and all who had anything to lose, had been pillaged without mercy, and those who had committed the outrage still held possession of the city. If his Holiness could be delivered by the intervention of France and England, surely he would be bound in gratitude to grant Henry his desire. This he might pledge himself to do beforehand if communications could be safely carried on with him. At least he might promise to make Wolsey his vicegerent for a time, invested with full powers to determine the King's cause as irrevocably as the Pope himself. If, however, he hung back, or stood in awe of the Imperialists, Wolsey and the French Cardinals would combine to treat his authority as null, and to declare invalid all the acts he might do during his captivity.

But the success of this policy at Rome depended in the first place on its success in France. And what were the prospects there? Here, too, it might be supposed, men were not very hopeful; for Wolsey, not to mince the matter, had cheated the most subtle diplomatists of France, and led them through a wonderful maze of negotiation, not only to seek the English alliance and give up all thought of making terms with the Emperor, but had compelled them to pay for Henry's friendship a price at which they would never have consented to buy it if they had known what they were about. And the lure employed was no other than the Princess Mary's hand, together with the hope that she would be sole heiress to the kingdom, and that whoever married her would be certain to succeed to the throne. Yet, at the very time these negotiations were going on the King had determined to make his daughter illegitimate!

The Princess Mary's hand, however, was not an object on which Francis had greatly set his heart. That which he had really in view all along was to find some mode of escaping the hard conditions of the treaty of Madrid, and at the same time recovering his two sons, whom he had left in the Emperor's hands as hostages for its fulfilment. The progress of the Turks in Hungary had so affected the Emperor as to

give some hope that he might be induced to forbear one of his most vexatious demands,—that, namely, for the cession of Burgundy,—if Francis would but marry his sister Eleanor and pay his own ransom. For a while this seemed the utmost that he could expect, and Francis himself confessed to the English ambassadors that if he had been asked to marry the Emperor's mule instead of the Emperor's sister, he would have done it, to recover his children. But Charles was so very grasping and ungenerous that the alternative of an English alliance at length appeared more hopeful—especially as Henry, on his side, showed symptoms of pliability by foregoing a demand he had originally made for the cession of Boulogne. By an alliance with England, offensive and defensive, the Emperor might be compelled to release his grip and grant more generous conditions under a threat of war. Hence the great embassy of the Bishop of Tarbes and others, to which we have already alluded. They arrived in England at the end of February, and were employed during the whole of March and part of April in discussing the terms of the new alliance, which was to be cemented by Francis giving up the thought of marrying Eleanor, and binding himself to the Princess Mary when she should come of age. The demands of Wolsey went much further than they had been led to expect, and though they tried hard to set them aside, the Cardinal was immovable. He maintained that those terms had been distinctly suggested by Francis himself, and he could not understand the ambassadors' hesitation. For the hand of an English Princess, sole heir to the crown, such terms were no more than reasonable. Francis must be already pledged to Eleanor, or he would make no difficulty about them; and if so, let him say it frankly, for Wolsey would assist him. The Princess could be married to his younger son, the Duke of Orleans, instead, and important abatements would be made. At length, the French conceded, not all that was originally demanded, but all that Wolsey probably ever expected them to grant, in the hope of getting the Princess for their master. But to their astonishment, Wolsey suddenly changed his tone, and when they were going to discuss the delivery of the Princess into France, quietly suggested that it would be really better, for the sake of peace, if Francis married Eleanor after all! Indeed, if he declined to do so, Wolsey intimated that the King would not make war on the Emperor on his account. Having got all he wanted, by the offer of the Princess Mary's hand, Wolsey, in fact, now practically withdrew the offer. The ambassadors were completely taken

aback. 'We have to do,' wrote Turenne to Francis I., 'with the most rascally beggar in the world' (*paillard* is the word he applies to Wolsey) 'and one who is wholly devoted to his master's interest.'

The treaty, however, was concluded with the provision that, whether Francis married Mary or not, he should pay Henry's expenses in his previous war against France, and a tribute of salt to the value of 15,000 crowns. It was a hard bargain, but it was the only way now by which Francis could hope to make the Emperor give him back his sons without the loss of Burgundy. The treaty, however, awaited confirmation, and Wolsey was sent to France to make a final settlement on some points. Such, at least, was generally understood to be the object of his mission. Cavendish, who accompanied him, believed afterwards that it was a device of his enemies to get him out of the way. But the main object certainly was to knit England and France more closely together by communicating to Francis the fact that Henry had embarked in a cause which must inevitably estrange him from the Emperor. England and France would hereafter be bound to each other by the need of mutual assistance; the integrity of France would be secured against Charles V.; and if the Pope was too much under the control of the Emperor, a large portion of Western Christendom would renounce its allegiance to the Holy See.

The Cardinal set out upon his mission. Never was ambassador invested with so much honour. Ambassador, indeed, he was not called; he was named the King of England's lieutenant, and whatever he said or did might be regarded as coming from the King himself. He had a train of 900 horsemen, and in it were some of the ablest of the King's councillors and leading men about the court. In France he was received with the highest possible distinction. French noblemen, in his progress through the country, were glad to do honour even to his gentleman usher. It is true he met with some displeasures; as, on one occasion, Cavendish reports, 'some lewd person, whosoever it was, had engraved in the great chamber window where my lord lay, upon the leaning-stone there, a cardinal's hat, with a pair of gallows over it, in derision of my lord.' Hatred of England, doubtless, lurked in the bosoms of the people, who only knew that the two countries had been twice at war when Wolsey had the direction of affairs, and, perhaps, had heard, in a general way, of the character given him by Turenne, as one who would go all lengths in his master's service. But the display of such a



feeling was confined to unknown men among the multitude. All Frenchmen of rank, or station, or character, knew that it was the policy of their King and the interest of their country to treat the English Cardinal with the most scrupulous respect. And in truth he was not a man to pass over lightly anything derogatory to the honour or interest of his master. Even Du Prat, the fat French chancellor, had sore work to make his peace with him, when in the course of their discussions Wolsey taxed him with attempting to hinder the league. This, Wolsey told him plainly, should never lie in his power; or if Francis were inclined to follow his counsel and break his promise to England, he should not fail to repent it after the Cardinal's return.<sup>1</sup> The threat was not an idle one, as Francis very well knew. But perhaps it was increased in vehemence from Wolsey's painful consciousness of the utter ruin that would befall him if he failed to make the union between the two kingdoms so entire that he might command the good offices of Francis without misgiving.

The greatest obstacle to this was the misgiving Francis might very well feel of Henry's sincerity, and the doubt whether it was worth while, after all, to make great sacrifices for a power which might give him no effectual aid in the object he had most at heart. To inspire him with confidence no means could be so effectual as to let him know that the King was embarked upon an enterprise which the Emperor could not view with favour, and that he was bent on counteracting, as far as possible, the Emperor's influence in Italy. No word was breathed about Anne Boleyn—perhaps, as Mr. Brewer suggests, Wolsey himself did not know at this time of Henry's determination to marry her;—but Francis was informed in the strictest confidence that Henry had determined to divorce his Queen, and would consequently be open to a new matrimonial alliance. The news, however, was not of a kind that could be kept entirely secret. It was hinted abroad that Madame Renée, daughter of Lewis XII., would ere long be Queen of England, and to Wolsey's great displeasure, a book was published in France, and even crossed the Channel, in which this was distinctly stated to have been one object of his mission.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Singer's *Cavendish*, i. 111.

<sup>2</sup> *Cavendish*, 118. The story that it was the Duchess of Alençon whom Henry intended to marry might have been an earlier surmise; for she had already married her second husband, Henry of Navarre, in January of this year. Or Wolsey might have dropped a hint on this occasion (which would have been perfectly safe) that if the Duchess had not been already married the King would very likely have offered her his hand.

But it was now, while engaged in the King's service abroad, that the great Cardinal's influence first suffered diminution. Henry had views of his own in connexion with this matter which he did not venture to impart even to his wisest and most trusty servant. Wolsey's plan was, first to obtain from the Pope a protestation that nothing done in the Papal Court to the prejudice of the King or his allies during his Holiness's captivity should be considered valid ; after which he meant to procure a commission for himself or his delegates to decide the cause without appeal. But Henry, influenced, perhaps, by the Boleyns, whose chief adviser at this time seems to have been Cranmer (he was chaplain to Anne Boleyn's father and tutor to herself), did not desire to increase the authority of his minister even for the sake of procuring a divorce. Besides, the success of the scheme was doubtful, and a mere divorce was not all that Henry required. He sent an ecclesiastic named William Knight to the Pope, charged to obtain a dispensation for the King to marry again,—if possible, without the necessity of a divorce at all. Bigamy, it would appear, was not so serious a matter to Henry VIII. as living in wedlock with his deceased brother's wife. The Pope could dispense for the first, but not for the second ; yet a dispensation for the first, if granted, would somehow put an end to those scruples about the second, which, without the relief of bigamy, were found to be intolerable !

Knight passed through France and saw Wolsey on the way, but his instructions were kept a profound secret from the Cardinal. His mission, however, was a total failure. He succeeded in obtaining access to the Pope only after the escape of the latter from Rome to Orvieto. After failing to obtain the desired form of dispensation, he presented to his Holiness a draft commission for Wolsey to hear the cause. The Pope referred it to Cardinal de Monte, who made numerous alterations, which Knight believed did not affect its substance, and he started for England, overjoyed to think that he had achieved his purpose. It was found, however, that the document was really of no validity at all. Knight's mission had only served to throw the Pope upon his guard by discovering to him the King's ultimate object, and had made the task, even for Wolsey, more difficult than it was before.

The draft commission which Cardinal de Monte altered so as to make innocuous, was in its original form as impudent a demand as could well have been preferred to the Holy See.

This would quite explain the story that such a marriage was actually projected by Wolsey.

It was to authorise Wolsey, with one assessor, who would doubtless have been the Archbishop of Canterbury, to make a private informal inquiry as to the validity of the dispensation under which Henry was married, and if satisfied of its insufficiency, to pronounce the marriage void without appeal, allowing either party to marry again, but at the same time, if they thought fit, declaring the issue of the first marriage legitimate as well as that of the second, notwithstanding all canonical objections. How even Wolsey could have hoped to persuade the Pope to listen to such a proposal it is difficult to imagine, except that he felt himself driven forward by a power he could not withstand to make desperate efforts in a very desperate cause. Even this commission, however, would not have done all that was required. A dispensation had to be obtained as well, in order that the new marriage contracted by the King might not be afterwards impugned: and both commission and dispensation were fair written on parchment, so that the Pope need only set his seal to them.

Why any dispensation should have been required for the King to marry Anne Boleyn when once he was declared free from his marriage with Catherine of Arragon, would not appear obvious to any one who had not perused the dispensation itself. But the original draft of that document, which is to be found in the Record Office, tells its own tale. It is full of corrections and interlineations, showing the extreme care and anxiety with which it was drawn up. It suspends, in this particular case, all canons relating to secret pre-contracts invalidating marriage, or forbidding marriage in the fourth degree, or relating to impediments caused by affinity, *even in the first degree*, arising *ex coitu illegitimo*. To comment upon the aim and object of these extraordinary provisions is undesirable. They are not the only evidence found in the State Papers of the truth of Sanders' statement as to the former connexion of Henry VIII. with Anne Boleyn's sister Mary.

After the Pope's escape, Wolsey, to whom the affair was once more entrusted, saw the necessity of altering his policy. He now desired, in order that his judgment might not be impugned on the ground that he was the King's subject, that one of the Roman Cardinals should be sent to England to try the case along with him. The Pope and his advisers, on the other hand, were more anxious that the King and Wolsey should take all the responsibility on themselves, and suggested that if Henry was satisfied of the goodness of his own cause, he might marry again without further ceremony. But of course

this would have left it open to the Queen to dispute the validity of the new marriage and to appeal in the last resort to Rome ; in which case, the result would assuredly not have been to the King's satisfaction. So in the beginning of the year 1528, Foxe, the King's almoner, and the celebrated Dr. Stephen Gardiner, who was at that time Wolsey's secretary, were sent to visit the Pope at Orvieto, and persuade him to supply the defects in the documents he had already granted, with a commission for Campeggio or some other Cardinal to come to England as Legate. Of all instruments that could have been chosen it would have been impossible to imagine one better adapted to promote the King's purpose than Gardiner. He was at home in the canon law and perfect master of the case. He had the whole subject at his fingers' ends ; he had studied every argument and every objection that could possibly be raised ; and he had either persuaded himself that the King was thoroughly in the right, or could play the part of an advocate with all the fervour of a man who was thoroughly convinced of the goodness of his cause. Gardiner spoke of the great services Henry had done to the Holy See, as entitling him to special favour ; he urged that the commission required, though unusual, was agreeable to the canon law, and that the welfare of the kingdom depended on its being passed ; he spoke for hours and hours of the manifest injustice of refusing it. The poor Pope hung back, made excuses, said he must take advice, and was sorry to own he knew nothing of the canon law. The more he looked into the subject the more difficult he found it. He had no desire to lose the friendship of England by contradicting Gardiner's strong assertion of the perfect reasonableness of Henry's demand ; but to concede his request was plunging into a sea of dangers. Even with the aid of all his Cardinals he could not make up his mind. At length Gardiner was emboldened to tell them that this continued hesitation was dishonourable to the College ; for it implied that they either could not or would not show the wanderer the right way. The King desired nothing but justice, and only asked their counsel. If they could not advise him, men would think that God had taken from the Holy See the key of knowledge, and that pontifical laws which the Pope himself could not interpret might as well be committed to the flames.

It was all to no purpose. His Holiness and the Papal Court could not be shamed into giving a decided answer,—even though it were a decided and well-merited rebuke.

Clement again confessed to Gardiner, in private, that he was not learned, and though it was a saying of the canonists *quod Pontifex habet omnia jura in scrinio pectoris*, yet he must frankly own God had never given him the key to open that cabinet, and he must be guided by his Cardinals, who were against his conceding the commission in the form first demanded. Gardiner was at length compelled to be satisfied with a mere general commission for Wolsey and Campeggio to try the cause together; but even this was not conceded in a way he entirely liked, nor was it conceded at all till he had threatened the Pope that, without it, England would be driven to abandon the Holy See entirely.

Wolsey, in fact, required a good deal more, and by the aid both of Gardiner and of Sir Gregory Casale, who as a native Italian understood the ways of Rome, had endeavoured to obtain, or thought of obtaining, from the Pope, a secret commission for himself to pass judgment on the validity of the Queen's marriage without any formal process. This he seemed to think the Pope might concede without fear, and in perfect reliance on his assurance that it should be kept secret from every eye.<sup>1</sup> At all events, a decretal commission might be granted to him and Campeggio, the authority of which should be absolute and without appeal. The commission granted to Foxe had two defects, which the Pope had said he was willing to supply; and it was suggested that he might do so by written promises under his seal to confirm the sentence as soon as it was passed, and not to revoke the cause while it was before the Legates. But it would be far more satisfactory that the decretal commission itself should contain these important securities, and Gardiner was urged again to use every art to have the matter thus arranged. Pressed in this manner, Clement wrote that, to show his gratitude to the King, notwithstanding the difficulty of the task, he would endeavour to find some means of satisfying him; and Casale at length obtained of his Holiness that a decretal such as they desired should be committed to Campeggio, who was now to be despatched to England forthwith.<sup>2</sup>

To the King and Anne Boleyn the matter seemed now as good as settled. Mrs. Anne, as she was called, was already

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar*, No. 4246. It does not appear certain, however, that this proposition was ever really submitted to the Pope. The original letter, signed and addressed, is now in the Record Office, where it would not likely have been found if it had been actually despatched.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar*, Nos. 4251 (p. 1872), 4290, 4348, 4355, 4379-80.

a recognised power at court. She received and expected attentions from everybody, and complained to Sir Thomas Heneage, of the King's chamber, that she feared Wolsey had forgotten her when he did not send her a 'token.' Flushed with the expectation of Campeggio's coming, the King wrote to her with a freedom and indelicacy which did little honour to the sentiment he entertained for her. Soon after his arrival she was lodged in a handsome suite of apartments within the royal palace of Greenwich, and greater court was paid to her every day than had been for a long time paid to the Queen.

Campeggio's coming was, however, for a long time delayed. Fits of the gout and other reasons caused him to loiter on his journey. Nor was it his real purpose, when he came, to pervert justice as the King would have him. He refused a bribe offered him by the English ambassador in France under the guise of payment of his travelling expenses, and he came to England determined to pursue his own course independently of his assessor Wolsey. Not that he was animated by a single-minded love of justice more than other great personages of the day. His intention was, in the first place, to endeavour to persuade the King to let the matter drop. He had express instructions to attempt a reconciliation between Henry and the Queen, and not to proceed to sentence without a new commission. If he could not move the King, he was willing to try and persuade the Queen to enter some religious order. If in this matter also he was unsuccessful, he might, perhaps, endeavour to prolong the suit as much as possible, but he would in no case proceed to judgment without express authority from Rome.

To this programme he strictly adhered during the whole of the twelve months to which his stay in England extended. Every effort was used by Wolsey after his arrival to bring the cause to a speedy hearing; but Campeggio showed himself intractable, and caught at every occasion and pretext of delay. It was long before he would even consent to show his commission to try the cause. In one of his private conferences with Wolsey, he at one time incautiously confessed that he was bound to submit his opinion to the Pope before proceeding to judgment. 'If that be the case,' exclaimed the English Cardinal, 'I will go no further with you in the business without authority. This is not fair treatment of the King.'<sup>1</sup> Campeggio had hard

<sup>1</sup> 'Si sic est, nolo negotiari vobiscum sine potestate, neque sic agitur cum rege.'—Campeggio to Sanga, Oct. 28, 1528. *Calendar*, No. 4881.



work to pacify him and explain away the admission. It was simply ruin to the Cardinal's policy, and Wolsey must have been conscious all along that this was the special danger. He had, indeed, tried to persuade the King at one time that an appeal to Rome by Catherine herself would not defeat his object;<sup>1</sup> but it could only have been a vain attempt to take responsibility off his own shoulders, and to mitigate beforehand the King's displeasure if the cause should be ultimately revoked. That no such revocation should take place he had done his very utmost to ensure; and though he had not been able to obtain all the security he desired, the Pope had given a written promise that he would ratify whatever sentence was passed by the Legates, and never suffer it afterwards to be impugned.<sup>2</sup> A promise so derogatory to the character and independence of the Holy See was of course only extorted by extreme importunity and menace. It was one, however, to which it would have been impossible to adhere, and Clement was all the more anxious to avoid being called upon to fulfil it. He stood bound to ratify the sentence whenever it was passed; but he gave the most strict injunctions to Campeggio not to let it be passed at all.

Moreover, it turned out that it was owing to the Pope himself that Campeggio declined even to show his commission to try the cause—the all-important decretal which it was promised should be sent by him. When Casale, acting on instructions from England, complained of the fact to his Holiness, Clement laid his hand upon his arm and forbade him to say more. He said he had been deceived in the matter; after very urgent entreaties he had granted the commission only to be shown to the King and to be burnt forthwith, but now Wolsey wished to make it public. 'I see,' he said, 'how much evil is likely to follow, and I would gladly recall what has been done, even to the loss of one of my fingers.' The ambassador very naturally remarked that it was asked for expressly for the purpose of being shown, although only to a few. Clement grew more and more excited and said the bull would be the ruin of him. 'But,' said the ambassador, 'consider what ruin and what heresy will be occasioned in England by alienating the King's mind. If the concession has been an evil, it is only a less evil to

<sup>1</sup> 'Which opinion and good conformity to justice, like as it has been by my lord's grace's high wisdom by little and little instilled into the King's breast, so his grace ceaseth not daily to increase the same by marvellous prudent handling and dexterity.'—Quoted in *Introd.* 353.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar*, Nos. 4169, 4550. See also No. 4251, p. 1872.

avoid a greater.' Clement tossed his arms about and cried out that he was too well aware of the prospect that was before him. 'I repent,' he said, 'of what I have done. If heresies arise, is it my fault? My conscience acquits me. None of you have reason to complain. I have performed my promise, and the King and Cardinal have never asked anything in my power which I have not granted with the utmost promptness. But I will do no violence to my conscience. Let them if they like send the Legate back again, and then do as they please, provided they do not make me responsible for their injustice.' 'Well,' said the ambassador, 'is your Holiness unwilling that proceedings should be taken under this commission?' 'No,' replied the Pope. 'But,' said Casale, 'Campeggio opposes your wish and dissuades the divorce.' 'Well, I ordered him to do so,' answered Clement, 'but he is to execute his commission.' 'Then we are at one, Holy Father,' said the other; 'and if so, what harm can there be in showing the decretal under an oath to some few of the Privy Council?' The Pope shook his head, and said: 'I know what they intend; but I have not yet read Campeggio's letters out of England. Come again to-morrow.'

Such is the account of the interview as reported by the ambassador himself. Ruin was indeed impending over Papal authority when it showed itself so vacillating and uncertain; when, governed solely by the dread of earthly powers, it conceded at one time what at another time it was anxious to recall. How was it possible in the nature of things that such authority should be long respected?

Fortune favoured in one thing this Fabian policy. A difficulty started up on which the King and Wolsey had not reckoned. Catherine had received information, or perhaps had known all along, that, besides the bull of dispensation granted by Julius II., a brief was preserved in Spain, dated the same day as the bull, and removing impediments to the marriage in the same terms as the bull itself, or even more completely. Of course the document would be used as evidence. It was therefore proposed to dispute its genuineness and to force the Queen, as if in her own interest, to write to Spain for its transmission to England, as no mere copy, however well authenticated, would satisfy the court. The Queen's counsel were accordingly spoken to and persuaded to become the means of betraying her interests by urging upon her a course so prejudicial to her cause. Catherine did as she was required. Watched and guarded on all hands, deprived of all honest counsel, and compelled, as it appears,

under oath, neither to write nor sign anything but what the King commanded her, she wrote to the Emperor to entreat that the document might be given up. But her chaplain, Abel, whom she sent to receive it, wrote by her desire at the very same time explaining the circumstances under which she had made the request, and urging that it should in no wise be complied with. The Emperor was warned and took care not to deliver the brief.

Desperate efforts were made by Wolsey and the King to overcome the obstacle. Ingenious arguments were discovered to make out a presumption that the document was a forgery. A new embassy was sent to Rome consisting of three Englishmen, and Peter Vaunes, the King's Latin secretary, who seems to have been an Italian, to act along with Sir Gregory Casale. They were to urge the Pope himself to pronounce the brief a forgery, or to get him to write peremptorily to the Emperor to send it to England, or to procure a decretal commission to the Legates to enable them to declare it spurious; or, finally, to get the Pope to revoke the whole cause to Rome, giving a written promise beforehand that he would pronounce sentence in Henry's favour.<sup>1</sup> That proposals so very dishonourable would ever have had a chance of being listened to is an idea we had rather not entertain. Certainly at that particular time they had no chance at all; for the Emperor's influence in Italy was increasing, and many of the Imperial captains who had been busy in the sack of Rome were still in dangerous proximity to the Pope. Not even the offer of a body-guard to his Holiness to be provided, as Wolsey hoped, at the joint expense of France and England as a security against Imperial domination in Italy, was likely to convert him entirely to Henry's wishes. The Emperor, indeed, was coming to Italy himself and offered to deliver the brief to the Pope in person. To expect his Holiness to declare it a forgery under such a pressure would have been absurd. It was clear nothing more was to be got in that quarter, and there was too much reason to apprehend worse things than non-compliance. For Catherine, notwithstanding the constraint to which she was subjected, had contrived, through the Spanish ambassador, to lodge an appeal against proceedings in England; and though the Pope for a while procrastinated, he could not but give effect to her protest by revoking the cause to Rome. In point of fact, after considerable discussion, he promised so to do.

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar*, Nos. 4978-80.

The laborious attempts of the King and Wolsey to pervert the course of justice were all in danger of being undone. They could do nothing now but push on the trial, and, if possible, obtain a sentence before they were interfered with. So the Legatine court was opened at Blackfriars, and both King and Queen appeared before it. What took place there is very well known, as the graphic account given by Cavendish has been substantially followed by Shakspeare. One slight correction only need be made to reconcile the dramatic version with the facts. The court was not prorogued by Campeggio in consequence of the Queen's withdrawal. On the contrary, her protestation was overruled and she was declared contumacious. The trial continued from day to day with brief adjournments, during which occurred a very remarkable incident, quite unknown till within the last few years, and never fully appreciated in all its details till the publication of Mr. Brewer's Introduction. On June 28, Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, appeared in court, and said that in a former audience the King had expressed before all men that he desired nothing but justice and sought relief from a scruple of conscience, on which he invited both the judges and every one else to throw what light they could. The Bishop, therefore, having given careful attention to the subject for two years, thought himself bound, for the sake of his own soul, to assert openly and declare reasons why the King's marriage could not be dissolved by any power, divine or human. In defence of this opinion he was ready to lay down his life; 'adding that as John the Baptist, in olden times, regarded it as impossible to die more gloriously than in a cause of matrimony—and it was not so holy then as it has now become, by the shedding of Christ's blood—he could not encourage himself more ardently, more effectually, or face any extreme peril with greater confidence than by taking the Baptist for his own example.'

His boldness produced a profound sensation. So abject was the political subserviency of public men that nothing of the kind could have been expected. Yet for the credit of the Church, it is satisfactory to know that he was followed by one other bishop and by the Dean of the Arches, who, Mr. Brewer thinks, was probably Ridley. But it was Fisher who had broken the ice and raised up an opposition to the King which could not be passed over. Henry drew up a reply, in the form of a speech, in which he bitterly attacked the Bishop for his presumption, assailing him with every term of abuse that spite and indignation could suggest. Scruples of con-

science were, as Mr. Brewer pithily remarks, in Henry VIII.'s opinion, 'exclusively a royal privilege in which bishops and subjects had no right to indulge.' Nevertheless, 'respect for law was never wanting in the most furious onsets of his passion.' Fisher's time for martyrdom was not yet come, and however greatly he had incensed the King, Henry expressed his displeasure, for the present, by nothing harder than words. A copy of the King's answer was submitted to the Bishop, who made comments on some of the statements in his own hand upon the margin; and it is from this exceedingly curious paper, now first brought to light by Mr. Brewer's labours, that we learn the full intensity of Henry's indignation.

The revocation of the cause to Rome put an end to the authority of the Legatine court in England. It also put an end to Wolsey's influence with the King. For the course to which Henry was now committed there was no longer any hope that the Cardinal could do him service. He was stripped of his offices, subjected to a *præmunire*, and, after forfeiting the whole of his property to the King's use, was sent to the North to see to the affairs of his own diocese of York, where perhaps he might have continued more happy than in power, had not the jealousy of the Duke of Norfolk and others who supplanted him induced them to seek his final ruin. For the King knew the worth of the man he had lost, and complained that other advisers were mere bunglers in comparison. So they used their influence with Anne Boleyn to procure his arrest for treason; on which, overcome by fear and sickness, he began a tedious journey to London, and died upon the way at Leicester Abbey.

Such was the end of the great Cardinal,—a man of truly grand ideas, as well as of transcendent powers, whose greatness as a statesman has never been fully appreciated. A thorough patriot, he raised England to that rank among the nations which she has since retained. He balanced the two great Powers of the Continent against each other, and made the friendship of England important to them both. He reformed the internal administration, economised expenditure, and did his utmost for the promotion of education. Unhappily, his high aims in one direction were opposed by ignorance and prejudice; in another they were contaminated by the prostitution of his spiritual functions to considerations of worldly policy. But the system of dual government which made that degradation possible in so great a man was now passing away for ever.

The termination of an old policy ought naturally to be

the beginning of a new one. Yet it was some years before the final breach took place with Rome. That which had occurred, however, could lead to no other issue; and the result, as in most revolutions, was due to the extreme assertion of the very opposite principle. It was Henry VIII., Defender of the Faith,—Henry VIII., the opponent of Luther and supporter of the unity of Christendom and the primacy of the Apostolic See,—Henry VIII., who had done what no king had done before him, allowed a tribunal within his kingdom deriving its authority from the Pope, and pleaded before it himself as a party. And it was the same Henry VIII. who, thinking these high merits should be rewarded by the gratification of his personal wishes, threatened, if they were not complied with, to disown the Pope, and cut off England from subjection to Rome. He had threatened this so often that he was obliged to fulfil his word; and he encountered on the whole very little opposition. The unity of Christendom and the authority of Rome were ideas every day losing their hold upon men's minds; and they were not strengthened in England by what had just occurred. If the King had been really justified in submitting to a foreign tribunal within his own realm, he was bound on the same principle to submit to a citation to Rome itself, the centre from which the Legatine authority derived its powers. But this would have been an indignity his subjects could ill have tolerated. They had been ill enough satisfied with what they had seen already, and could not have endured to see their King act as a vassal of the Roman Pontiff.

So, however unpopular the divorce was in England—and unpopular it certainly was—the King was supported by national feeling in the final separation from Rome. The theoretical supremacy of the Apostolic See had now become, for Englishmen at large, a practical absurdity, for which none but zealous canonists and a few monastic devotees cared strongly to contend. Not even Sir Thomas More, who died a martyr to the principle, would have perilled his life in its defence if silence on the subject could have saved him; and it shows how little the Papal supremacy really was regarded, when an oath could be generally exacted to abjure it without creating general disaffection. The first great step in the English Reformation—a step which the chief agent himself would fain have avoided taking—was submitted to with very little resistance. Beyond the vindication of royal authority over the Church, the Reformation in Henry's reign did not practically advance at all. But in that one step was in-

volved the whole of what afterwards followed,—the right of a national church to define its own position and to draw up its own articles, ordinances, and formularies of devotion.

We have limited ourselves in these remarks only to one great subject, out of many which have received a wealth of illustration in the work before us. To do justice to them all is simply impossible for any but the regular historian. On the many great events of the time,—such as the battle of Pavia, the treaty of Madrid, the invasion of Hungary by the Turks, the sack of Rome,—and more than all, upon the wonderful career of Wolsey, the high aims of his foreign policy and his efforts at home to create educational institutions by the dissolution of the smaller monasteries, Mr. Brewer's Introduction and Calendar contain stores of information altogether new and a digest of that information quite invaluable. But for these things we must refer our readers to the volumes themselves. A few words more we may add on our immediate subject. Mr. Brewer concludes with some very interesting remarks on the general character of the English Reformation, in which he exhibits the Church of England as having derived from the first, as it still derives, its chief support from the middle classes. 'Among the upper and lower elements of society,' he writes, 'although its ministrations may be accepted as a matter of course, the Church of the Reformation has never excited much enthusiasm.' It is the middle classes, mainly, that have built and filled our churches. The poor are not to be lured into them, and the aristocracy, with one or two brilliant exceptions, are lukewarm in their zeal where they have not remained Roman Catholic to this day. This state of things is due to the special influences by which the Reformed Church was surrounded at its birth. The nobility, crushed by the Wars of the Roses, had lost their former influence with the Crown, and Henry VIII. was moved to do what he did, and supported in doing it, mainly by the growing influence of the middle classes. The practical, utilitarian spirit of the new era saw with complacency the suppression of monasteries, the diminution of useless celebrations of saints, the elimination of all that was mystical and much that was poetical in the older worship. From that time usefulness has become the general standard of what is right, and usefulness as it appears from the point of view of the middle classes. Even Bishops, as a rule, have yielded to this influence, and in the exercise of their uncontrolled dominion over their clergy have been guided less by ecclesiastical



precedent than by public opinion—which, in general, means opinion of the middle classes only.

Such appears to be Mr. Brewer's view of the power which has shaped the destinies of the Reformed Church of England. In his future volumes we shall look with interest to see how far this view is justified. As yet he has only shown us the secret history of the divorce, and even that remains to be completed. Hereafter he will have to treat of the passing of the Act of Supremacy, the suppression of the monasteries, and the progress of the Reformation under Thomas Cromwell. It remains to be seen whether there was any real gain in the dissolution of religious houses, or any real loss in the withdrawal from the poor of the services of begging friars; whether the lower orders, whom we are now trying to educate without religion, became more Christian or more enlightened by witnessing vast acts of confiscation,—in short, what wheat there was amid the tares burnt up in the great purifying fire of the Reformation.

But for the present we forbear from pursuing these inquiries. A just estimate of the Reformation in all its manifold aspects can only be formed in that fuller light which the further prosecution of Mr. Brewer's labours will enable us to attain. Meanwhile, we must be prepared to part with many a cherished theory which has even now become untenable. The idea, for instance, that the teaching of Wycliffe, or the Lollardism of the fifteenth century, had laid the foundations of a Reformation in the sixteenth, receives no countenance in Mr. Brewer's Introduction. 'There is no reason,' he says pointedly, 'to suppose that the nation as a body was discontented with the old religion. Facts point to the opposite conclusion.' Notwithstanding all that was done by the Reformers in the reign of Edward VI., the accession of Mary was generally popular; and even far down in the reign of Elizabeth it is computed that the old faith had a majority of adherents among the people. But still more convincing evidence to this effect must occur to any one who will study for himself the mass of original documents brought together by Mr. Brewer's Calendar; for if anything like Lollardism had been prevalent at so late a period as the reign of Henry VIII., it is impossible but some indication of it would have appeared in the many thousands of letters and papers that have been already catalogued. From the commencement of the reign to the death of Wolsey not a single subject of domestic interest is now unknown to us; every incident, from a pageant at court to a riot in a country

town, receives some kind of notice. But of any remains of Lollardism among the people there is very little evidence. Isolated cases of heresy there certainly were just at the beginning of the reign; and some years later there was a good deal of Lutheranism imported from Germany. But there is nothing to show that either the one or the other commanded much sympathy among the people at large. All the evidence, in fact, points exactly the opposite way.

Once more we would express our gratitude to Mr. Brewer, and with it our anxiety for the prosecution of his labours. We are aware that he has other duties by no means unimportant, but it would be a serious misfortune if these were to be allowed to interfere with a work of such high national and historical importance. What he has already done is simply invaluable. No period of English history is now so clear and lucid, so intelligible in all its bearings, as the first part of the reign of Henry VIII.; and it is of the utmost consequence that the work should be carried on as it has been begun. No one else, we believe, among English scholars, could have been found even to attempt so great a work. No one else, we feel quite assured, could have devoted to it the same critical sagacity, unflagging industry, and profound acquaintance with historical literature.

---

### ART. III.—POSITIVE AND COSMIC RELIGION.

1. *Catechism of Positive Religion*. By AUGUSTE COMTE. Translated by R. CONGREVE. (London: 1858.)
2. *Positive Polity*. By AUGUSTE COMTE. Translated by F. HARRISON. (London: 1875.)
3. *First Principles*. By HERBERT SPENCER. (London: 1870.)
4. *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*. By JOHN FISKE. (London: 1874.)

THE religious reader has probably been accustomed to think of the philosophies of M. Comte and Mr. Spencer as holding a position of pure negation towards every truth which he esteems dear. In these systems the course of phenomena which we perceive, linked by no deeper principle of cause than the fact that we experience their succession, forms the

sum total of our knowledge. The spiritual world vanishes out of sight. The religious hopes and fears of mankind, the moral aspirations, the needs of conscience and the records of past religious history on which we built as inspired by the Eternal Spirit and teaching lessons of eternal truth, are regarded as being themselves only phenomena in a physical progress and development of things. Man's highest thought is but a link in this evolution, like the growth of a plant towards the light or the instincts of a beast. And too many among us have experience that the practical operation of these philosophies is apt to be completely negative towards religion. Even if ourselves untouched, it is well if we have not some friend from whose mind a brief study of these works, or even the spirit of them, which seems to come without study through the very air we are breathing, has sufficed to sweep away all the faith of his fathers and all the lessons of his childhood and leave him in appearance and profession as destitute of religion as if its name had never been heard in the world.

And yet, though this be so, we may, without for the moment questioning the soundness of these philosophies, observe a point of view in which their attitude towards religion must be, as their authors claim that it is, distinctly conservative. They are vast schemes of evolution. The Cosmic system traces on uniform principles the formation of worlds, the growth of life, the actions and thoughts of mankind. Each step is linked on to that which preceded it, nor does any power exist in any atom or aggregate of atoms, in any thing or man, to stir out of the course of evolution, to be or do anything except that to which all preceding movements of the forces of the universe have led. Though in the Comtean philosophy evolution be not worked out upon so grand a scale, yet the inexorable dependence of every act and thought of every man upon precedent facts is no less strongly stated by the Positivist than by the Cosmist. In particular, the laws of the fixed series in which man's mental and spiritual development are supposed to move, are laid down by Comte with stern precision. Now it would be contrary to the first principles of such philosophy as this to suppose that a great department of human habit and belief, such as religion is, could vanish all at once before the breath of an argument. A great belief is a great fact, which must have its sequence of facts succeeding it as certainly as the force of the water must be followed by the motion of the mill-wheel. To suppose that a few philosophic reasons could expunge from the minds of a generation the moulding effect of the previous religious centuries would

be to reduce the doctrine of evolution itself to an absurdity. It would be to suppose a new commencement made in the thought of mankind without being evolved out of the preceding states. It would be to suppose that a force had been at work within the world of mind which had been followed by no effects.

For it cannot be doubted that religion, as it has displayed itself in the long course of past centuries and displays itself still among the mass of mankind, possesses all the characteristics of a real and important force. Any philosophy, then, which teaches evolution must recognise some form of thought and feeling which shall be the natural successor and representative of that which mankind have called their religion. The true evolutionist could not endure to observe a fact in inanimate nature or a habit in any beast, of the causes of which no account could be given or which should be supposed to vanish into nothingness without any effects. Slight and temporary developments may indeed arise and fade away for want of adaptation to surrounding circumstances. Even of the origin and fate of these a system of evolution ought to be able to render account; nor could they be supposed to vanish suddenly from any race or individual which had possessed them. But religion is not a slight or temporary characteristic of man; it is a habit and bent of his powers in their best and highest exercise, as fixed in its essence, though various in its forms, as any of the most necessary processes of his mind or body. If we were to suppose an evolutionist declaring that religion, being what it is in our race, was evolved out of no great and permanent facts in our constitution and position, and that no permanent effects are to be evolved out of it, the declaration would be fatal to the theory of things which he professes to teach.

It is true that religion in this view presents itself only as an obstinately persistent fact in human nature, like the tendency of pointers to point, or of plants to grow. And this may seem to detract from the validity of religion as a conclusion of the intellect and eternally true. But in the view of the philosophies of which we speak this obstinate persistence in consciousness is the only kind of sanction that even the conclusions of man's intellect can claim. The very processes of mind to which these authors appeal in proving their systems can but say for themselves that minds are what they are, and that however it comes they are formed to think thus or thus. And if religion can claim the same persistence in the mind of man, it plainly demands a place in any system which makes its boast to recognise facts as they are.

Thus there is, or ought to be, a wide difference between the forms of unbelief based on these great physical systems and those which resulted from the dialectical philosophies of the last century. When these latter had disproved to their satisfaction the arguments on which the theory of religion rested, it seemed to them that they had disposed of it. But physical science, though it must be allowed to correct the form of religion by the light of discovered facts, yet is bound to say what form that shall be more consistent with truth it proposes that this undoubted fact in human natural history shall assume—or at least to provide for its assuming some form.

Affirmative teaching on religion does not now appear to physical philosophers in the light of a necessary duty; the office being performed for them by others, who do it so over-zealously as to require from the wisdom of science nothing but opposition and negation. But if we could suppose all religious teachers silenced, science would be obliged in reason to state some theory which might account for and satisfy the religious habits of the race. And practical philosophers would feel an urgent call to establish some form of religious practice which might save so imperative a requirement of mankind and one so capable of happy and useful applications from stretching out its yearning hands in vain.

But when we speak of affirmative religious teaching as a duty which physical science has not yet adequately performed, we do not mean that the view we have been taking is not perfectly accepted by the philosophies of the day. There has been no hesitation on their part in recognising religion among the observed facts of human nature, or in acknowledging that it must find a permanent place amidst the mental life of the future in succession to that which it has found in the past. And if the study of the works of M. Comte and Mr. Spencer has had for its usual effect a total rejection of religion, which leaves the feelings unsatisfied, the moral nature weakened, and the mind uncertain whether anything be true—that is a result which must be deplored by the orderly evolutionist as due to want of preparation in the subject, not to the proper application of his principles, which in themselves claim to be conservative. Thus Mr. Harrison on the part of Positivism lays claim to all the recognised terms of Christian theology, and declares that it is the pedantry of sect alone which can dare to monopolise to a special creed those precious heirlooms of our common race, the ideas of religion, priesthood, spiritual life, the worship of a Supreme Power, the communion of the faithful, and the immortality of the soul; <sup>1</sup> while Mr. Fiske,

speaking for the Cosmic philosophy, professes that his aim is simply to point out some of the more important modifications which current religious doctrines seem destined to undergo in becoming accepted and assimilated by thinkers whose theories of things are based solely upon irrefragable scientific truths.<sup>1</sup>

Not only have we these general recognitions of religion. Though the faith of the future can hardly be said to have been proposed by Cosmic or Positive science in a complete form for the acceptance of mankind, yet in both cases the lines on which the amendment of our religion is to be based have been laid down, and, by Positivism at least, a portion of a new building erected, in which a limited circle of believers find a refuge. So that we possess materials for determining how far these developments of religion are likely to be successful in establishing themselves, and, especially, how far they are themselves true to the principles on which their alteration of all previous forms of belief are founded. What these principles are will appear if the reader will give his attention to the following brief statement of the problem of religion in its most elementary form. It depends upon the relations of the knowable and the unknowable.

We find ourselves in this world possessed of certain capacities of knowledge, and when we ask what knowledge is, we find that we can only know things as they stand relatively to our own minds, and that knowing always requires and, indeed, consists in definition. We know things and people and facts when we give them a defined position in our conceptions. We must know how they stand in relation to other things, people, and events; they must assume a place in our minds bounded by certain mental limits—and our knowledge of them becomes real in so far as they thus fall into their own defined place in our consciousness. Now that which is definite must apparently be finite. That which is relative cannot apparently be also absolute. And this appears to imply that what is properly called knowledge can only concern itself with such things as can submit to be limited and defined relatively to our own bounded intelligence; not, therefore, to what lies beyond the course of phenomena presented to us. The very names of the Absolute and Infinite imply that they are incapable of such restriction. Nevertheless, we are persistently conscious that the knowable

<sup>1</sup> *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, vol. ii. p. 471.

does not fill the sum of things with which we have to do. We are certain that beyond what we know there lies something which we cannot know. Nay, this something forces itself into the region of our knowledge, and mingles so inextricably with every part of it, that whenever we look steadily enough at anything which we think we know we find it pass into mystery and the unknowable. There is no school of thought, no individual thinker, be his powers great or small, who will not confess that there is an unknowable; though the meaning attached to the confession and the emphasis laid on it may differ in different mouths as widely as do the paths by which the unknowable may be reached. Some men, pursuing back the idea of cause along the linked succession of the history of things and the forces of nature, find it pass out at length into a first cause and an unknowable force, which, though lying beyond things known, yet must be believed in; some men find the unknowable in their very contact with the outward world and their struggles with the problem how they can know that there is an outward world or what it is; to some men the moral life and the voice of conscience within seems to bring them into contact with some mysterious source of command beyond the people and circumstances around them; while to some the harmony and unity into which all things group themselves seem to speak of some undefinable power of unity which binds them together. But others regard the unknowable only as the undiscovered residue implied in calling our knowledge relative or limited.

Now to some of these last the unknowable is a pure negation, the name of a region with which we can have no mental connexion, and of which we need not think. To others of them it means that which, though not capable of definition, yet forces itself upon us as positively existing and acting from a sphere beyond our grasp of thought. And this appears to be the characteristic difference between the school of Mr. Spencer and M. Comte. They both hold with equal emphasis that the succession of phenomena, as they display themselves in relation to our minds, forms the whole subject-matter of our knowledge, and that hypotheses which cannot be verified by experiments upon phenomena must not be admitted. But the Cosmic school of Mr. Spencer recognises an absolute but entirely unknowable power manifested in the world of phenomena.<sup>1</sup> And Positivism rejects or neglects this unknowable. Whether this distinction is philosophically a real one is a question on which we shall not

<sup>1</sup> Fiske's *Cosmic Philosophy*, part i. ch. x.



enter. But it certainly produces a variety of treatment, by the respective schools, of the question of religion, by which they differ as widely each from the other as both do from all previous faiths.

All previous faiths, however different among themselves, agree in this, that they are founded upon the idea that the unknowable is *specially revealed in selected facts within the region of the knowable*. The various methods of reaching the unknowable, which we have above mentioned, imply that there are various facts among the things known, from any of which we may make the spring into the unknown. And according to the difference of the facts in which they seek revelation, men find differences in the things revealed. Some fix attention upon the marks of design in the universe, and believe that they find a Creator in the unknowable region beyond. Some believe that in the facts of human consciousness and in the moral nature of man a God who approves virtue makes His presence felt. Some take the same lesson from the facts which show a moral government of the universe. Some hold that the progress and development of things gradually reveal a governing intellect. Some, going further, profess that some series of historical events, or the words or writings of some man, are revelations of the unknowable. But all from the Deist to the Mohammedan or the Christian believe that in *some* phenomena more than others, and in some differently from others, the unknowable makes itself known. The slightest reflection will make this plain to any one. If a man believes that an unknowable God is made known to him as a moral governor, he must think that the unknowable is revealed to him in the events by which moral beings are rewarded or punished more than, or differently from, the manner in which it is revealed in the tossing of waves or the springing of grass. One who believes in God as creator must hold that the first creative impulse in which development had its beginning makes special revelation to us of the powers and tendencies of the unknowable; while one who believes that an increasing purpose is to be discerned in the progress of the ages must hold, that in the developed condition of the universe and of life upon it, more is to be known of the unknowable than could be discerned in the first stirring of an atom. And it is but the same principle differently applied when believers in Christianity acknowledge that He whom no man hath seen at any time is declared to us in Jesus Christ.

No doubt there is mystery and there is difficulty in this

conception. The unknowable seems to become known, and to take its place amidst the series and connexion of known phenomena. That which by its very nature refuses to submit to limits appears to stand in relation to events, and to be restricted by their conditions. And some earthly circumstances are regarded as containing more and some less of the action of that which, being infinite, is not capable of being measured by more or less. Miracles and special providences on the one side, and the existence of evil on the other, are but examples of our perception of more or less of God's agency in facts. These are mysteries; but we cannot allow this to be a fatal objection to their truth, since the whole idea of an unknowable known even to exist is itself essentially mysterious, yet impossible to evade. And the relativity of our knowledge may itself be the cause of these apparent contradictions in our conceptions. However, it is not our present task to defend the idea of revelation, but to point out that the element common to all religions, common even to the religion of a personal God with Mr. Matthew Arnold's 'Eternal which makes for righteousness,' is that the unknowable is specially revealed in select phenomena perceived by us.

Now this is a conception which cannot be accepted by either Cosmic or Positive philosophy; which are therefore accustomed to reject upon principle, and without examining the evidence, any system of religion which rests on this supposition of special revelation. We have seen that these philosophies are both willing to recognise that there is an unknowable—though the former makes the recognition in an affirmative, the latter in a negative sense. But their unknowable would cease to deserve its name if it could be supposed to enter as a special element into particular phenomena either within the mind or in the outward world. In that case it would be entering into a sphere from which the definitions of the philosophy exclude it. The course of phenomena, according to these views, forms one stream, every part of which is connected with every other part, so that in whatever sense it is true that all the causes of any phenomenon lie within the limits of things known, in exactly the same sense is this true of every other phenomenon. Side by side with this stream of phenomena runs another stream, the unknowable; it does not open into the knowable by special channels in special places, but is as near to it and as far from it in any one place as in any other. So far as the two streams may be said to be in relation to one another, they are in constant and unchanging

relation. For instance, let us consider some great group of phenomena in which men have been accustomed to see revelations of the unknowable : the prevalence, say, of the religious sentiment among the highest races of mankind, or the retributions which in the course of the world come to good and to evil deeds, or the asserted inspirations of the Bible. The Positivist would not, as we conceive, declare that there was no unknowable element in such phenomena ; the Cosmist would certainly contend very strongly that there was. They would say that these states of mind and these circumstances of life, when you study them very deeply, run up into the unknowable. But it would be said they have also a series of antecedents in the known course of things which accounts for them, and which necessarily produced them, in the same sense in which any ordinary circumstance is produced and accounted for by preceding circumstances, and that connexion with the unknowable which you trace in them you may in the same sense trace in thoughts and in events of a precisely opposite character. When a man gets drunk and beats his wife you may trace up every movement of mind and nerve concerned in the transaction to a point where it escapes into the unknowable, just as those concerned in lofty thoughts and just retributions did before. And just in the same sense as the lofty thoughts had their antecedents in the known course of things which inevitably produced them, is the same thing true of these wicked and degrading acts.

Thus, it would be contended, words which express qualities of actions, such as Good or Evil, Moral or Immoral, and words which express relations, such as Creator, Governor, Ruler, Father, all spring up within the region of known phenomena, and express ideas which take their whole meaning from that region. The unknowable equally underlies the whole, but its connexion with what is known ceases at an earlier point than that at which any of these notions take their rise ; nor can you attribute any of these epithets to it, or ascribe to it in any special sense the phenomena within the region of the knowable to which they are applicable.

We hope that we have now made clear the difficulty which Positive and Cosmic philosophy have in accepting that conception of a revelation of the unknowable in special known facts, which is common to all the religions hitherto believed in by men. And yet these philosophies are obliged to face the difficulty, since in their loyalty to facts they are obliged to recognise religion as existing and demanding satisfaction.

We shall imagine a thinker in a condition of mind which we believe to be exceedingly common. He is imbued with the spirit of physical philosophy, which compels men to seek a physical cause for everything alike. When he observes religion and self-denial in some men he admires them heartily, but he has an instinctive objection to attributing them to any special interference of an unknowable power. He throws them back upon bodily constitution, habit, education, circumstance, at all events upon earthly antecedents, which have necessarily produced them; and he attributes wickedness to similar causes. He is not without awe; he does not imagine himself to understand everything to the bottom. But the sense of mystery and the presence of the unknowable follow him everywhere alike; the good and the evil spring both from it. This is his philosophy. But in registering the known facts upon which he boasts to build his system, he is struck with the fact of religion as existing in mankind with a certainty and in proportions which refuse to be ignored. Looking, as his philosophy binds him to do, not out upon mankind from his own constitution, but in upon himself, from the great experiences of the race, he finds that according to all rules of continuity he ought to have some of this thing called religion, which so emphatically belongs to his antecedents. Perhaps this call for religion will not be a mere suggestion of his intellect, but will be prompted by his moral nature and his sentiments, even in opposition to his philosophy. How, then, is he to satisfy this call for himself, or if not for himself, for his race? For religion, in the forms in which it has hitherto presented itself, seems to demand something which his philosophy cannot concede; a disturbance of the course of physical connexions by the intermingling of the unknowable in various proportions with the physical phenomena of the world or with the thoughts of men, which in truth are to him only one department of the phenomena of the world. How, then, shall he do?

It is plain that when the special revelation of the unknowable in special facts is set aside as inadmissible, there remain only two other sources from which religion can be supplied. These are: the knowable as such, and the unknowable as such. It might be thought that as we are forbidden to bring down the unknowable into the midst of the knowable, we might find amidst the things known themselves something which should satisfy all those moral and spiritual desires which are called religious. Man might provide himself with a religion which should no more take into account the existence

of the unknowable than does his affection for his mother or his obedience to the civil magistrate. Or, on the other hand, it might be thought that a religion was to be found in the recognition of an unknowable power underlying everything and everything alike, without in the least supposing this power to make itself knowable by assuming a special relation to any special phenomena. Evidently these are the only two resources which are open when the principle of a revelation has been rejected. For a religion must consist, if not of a mixture of the unknowable with the knowable, such as all hitherto existing religions have acknowledged, then of the unknowable pure and simple or the knowable pure and simple. Now Positive religion adopts the latter, Cosmic the former expedient. Positivism professes to give us a sufficient religion constructed out of things which we experience without introducing the unknowable beyond. And Cosmism declares itself to reach the desired object by means of the unknowable in all its original mystery untainted by any supposition of special connexion with things known. We are about to examine the two systems of religion in this point of view. And the special method of our examination will be this—that, while we shall not decline to make such observations as may come in our way upon the truth and sufficiency of the proposed religion, our chief object will be to find whether they are really constructed out of the materials to which they profess to restrict themselves, or whether they do not in reality use the old principle of a revelation of the unknowable in special phenomena, thereby bearing a strong involuntary testimony to the indelible fixity of this conception in the experience and the belief of mankind.

We begin, then, with Positive religion. To understand the nature of this religion we must appreciate the condition of mind in which it takes its rise. The philosophy to which it belongs aims to set forth the laws of the different phenomena that are open to observation; and by the laws of phenomena are meant their unvarying relations of succession and resemblance by which we are able to foresee some by virtue of our knowledge of others. This faith puts aside as absolutely beyond our reach and essentially conducive to no useful result every inquiry into the *causes* properly so called, either first causes or final, of any events whatever. In its theoretical conceptions it never explains *why* a thing is: it limits itself to the question, *how* it is.<sup>1</sup> Thus every form of belief in a supernatural power is rejected.<sup>2</sup> We find ourselves alone with our

<sup>1</sup> Comte's *Catechism of Positive Religion*, p. 57.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 45.

experiences. What we see and feel; what other men have felt—provided that we can verify their claim to have felt it—these palpable and tangible things form the whole material which we have at command for any purpose, the construction of a religion among the rest. That whole region of the spiritual or unknowable from which religions have been drawn is locked and barred against us. It exists for us only in a negative sense. We know nothing of it.

It might seem that in this case all religion is impossible. But Comte thinks otherwise. He believes that among the phenomena of which we have experience we can find an object which is capable of giving satisfaction to the religious wants of man, and of continuing forward, without further break than necessary progress requires, a succession in the future to the great historic religions of the past. Though God, not being among phenomena, is for us non-existent, yet we may have a church, a worship, a priesthood, sacred seasons, everything by which religion has in time past given delight and moral aid to man.

The object of this Positive religion is Humanity. From amidst the infinite succession of phenomena we choose out this one, Mankind. We 'condense the whole of our Positive conceptions in the one single idea of an immense and eternal being, Humanity, destined by sociological laws to constant development under the preponderating influence of biological and cosmological necessities. This, the real Great Being, on whom all, whether individuals or societies, depend as the prime mover of their existence, becomes the centre of our affections.'<sup>1</sup> From Humanity comes to us all that civilisation, education, and order, for which we have to be thankful. And Humanity requires all the service we can in our turn render. We have the word of a great writer, Mr. J. S. Mill, that he found this idealised Humanity a very comprehensible object of religion. And we suppose that at least every one is capable of understanding what the conception is.

But there arises, from the very nature of the Positive philosophy, a fatal objection to this deification of Humanity. 'The compound existence of Humanity is ever founded on the free concurrence of independent wills.'<sup>2</sup> That which makes Humanity a comprehensible object of human devotion is the sympathy which each human being, in the eager freedom of his action, has for the aims, the struggles, and the victories of free human beings like himself. But this freedom, which gives to

<sup>1</sup> Comte's *Catechism of Positive Religion*, pp. 63, 64.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*



humanity its interest for each of mankind, does not exist in the theoretical conceptions of Positivism, whose fundamental dogma is 'the fact of the existence of an order which admits no variation.'<sup>1</sup> And though Comte proceeds to inform us that the order of nature always answers to the idea of a necessity which admits modification, and as such becomes the indispensable basis of the order which man introduces,<sup>2</sup> we must declare ourselves quite unable to understand the meaning of a necessity which admits modification. Of course he cannot mean to except man from the invariable order and give him a power of modifying the course of phenomena which is denied to any other known force. This exception would be a surrender of the Positivist position. For it would be the recognition of human free will as a cause in that very sense in which causes are excluded from the philosophy. The system which drives out of itself on the one side the causation of God must needs drive out on the other the causation of man. But if, on the other hand, human free will (so called), human affections, interests, struggles, doubts, and determinations are all recognised as part of the march of the invariable order, we do not say that they lose their interest for us, but they certainly lose all distinctness in point of principle from the movements of the lower beings and the inanimate things around.

Nor is this a mere theoretical objection. It would be practically impossible for a man acting and thinking on the basis of Positivism to retain the sense of distinction between man and the rest of the world which has been fostered under theories of a quite different nature. Man and beast, rising tide and whirling planet, become alike parts of a system of inflexible order; and on what principle is it that one is to select a part of this order and make it a god? Thus we can conceive a Darwinian addressing to a priest of Positive religion the question, At what point in the development of the anthropoid ape are we to suppose that it becomes part of the Supreme Being? And, then, where will you draw the line between these apes and the creatures next below them in development? And then, where will you stop until you come to the original atoms? Mr. Fisk, who believes in Cosmic religion, objects somewhere to the Positive that it is not justified by the position which man holds in the universe; and the objection seems on Positivist principles unanswerable. You cannot reduce individual man to a kind of nothingness

<sup>1</sup> Comte's *Catechism of Positive Religion*, p. 58.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 61.



and then place Humanity in general in a position which implies the divinest qualities of intellect and will. Your object is to construct a religion out of the knowable. If so, you must take in the whole knowable, since every part of it on your own principles hangs on to every other. And the worship of the whole knowable is a thing neither easily grasped by the spirit nor very elevating in moral tendency.

However, we shall suppose this difficulty got over, and the selection of Humanity from the rest of the knowable accomplished. Now Positive religion deals with individual members of Humanity in the past, whom it sets up as guardian angels, and also with Humanity past, present, and future, which is the Supreme Being. We shall speak first of the guardian angels. Positivism does not introduce into its worship all the dead, but makes a selection of the worthy, for the accomplishment of which selection an elaborate process is prescribed to be observed whenever the religion shall have obtained its established position. These worthy ones (whose conscious life is of course regarded as past for ever) are to possess a 'subjective existence' for religion—that is to say, an existence in the remembrance of their worshippers. But it is not as they existed in the world that they are to exist in religion. Their faults are all to be left out in their subjective existence. 'Our Divinity only incorporates into herself the dead who are really meritorious. But in doing so she puts away from each the imperfections which in all cases dimmed their objective life.'

Now in this selection from among men, and in this selection from among the qualities of men, we seem to observe Positivism wandering quite away from that region of objective fact to which its formulæ bind it down. The taunt which Positivism and Cosmism are alike wont to cast at the old religions is that they are unverifiable: they cannot be submitted to scientific experiment. Now let us consider the case of M. Comte's guardian angel, Madame Clotilde de Vaux. He endows her with a subjective immortality, and requires that for his sake she should be enshrined as a guardian angel in the system of universal religion. But the guardian angel called by her name is not to be the remembrance of her as she was, but with all her faults left out. Who is to verify the guardian angel Clotilde de Vaux, and by what process known to science is he to do it?

But even this is not all. In the subjective life which guardian angels possess, the outward order of the world 'becomes simply passive. It ceases to have any but the

indirect influence attaching to it as the original source of the ideas we wish to cherish. The dead we love are no longer under the rigorous laws of the material world, nor even under the general laws of life.' No religion has ever claimed an exemption from the laws of life for its angels or saints. What religions have believed is the existence of laws of life beyond the earthly ones, which confer real objective existence upon those they love. The reader will therefore observe that Comte's doctrine of guardian angels is neither to be confounded on the one hand with the remembrance of the dead, in which unbelievers and believers alike experience an elevating influence, nor with the faith in a life beyond the grave which religion has fostered. All remember the dead as they were, subject, as we ourselves are, to imperfections and to the laws of life, and therefore an example to us. And those who believe in the future life believe in it as enjoyed subject to the heavenly laws of life, and if faults vanish there it is because, according to the laws of spiritual progress, they actually do so. But Comte requires us to set all laws at defiance: first, by giving a subjective existence to persons who do not really exist at all; secondly, by arbitrarily taking away from them qualities which, while they were alive, belonged to them as essentially as any other; and, thirdly, by exempting these beings from the laws of life. And this we are to do with so absolute a confidence in its consistency with fact and truth that we are to make it the basis of our religion. We are to pray to these guardian angels: and Mr. J. S. Mill makes a mistake when he says that prayer in Positivism does not mean asking; for while Comte declares the main object of a Positivist's prayer to be the expression of his best affections, he proceeds also to say that 'he may also ask, though he asks only for a noble progress which he ensures almost in the very asking.'<sup>1</sup> 'Each man should begin his day with a due invocation of his angels. This alone can dispose us habitually to the right use of all our powers. In the last prayer we express the gratitude due to them for their protection during the day, and we hope thus to ensure its continuance during our sleep.'<sup>2</sup>

Now, the simple question which we have to put to the reader concerning this part of Positive religion is this—Is it constructed out of the knowable? Suppose that this doctrine of guardian angels were to be put forth as a part of a revealed religion, is there the slightest doubt that Positivists would say

<sup>1</sup> *Ca'echism*, p. 106.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 124.

to its advocates, 'When you imagine a humanity separated from the rest of the universal order, when you divest humanity of its faults, when you confer upon it an existence after it has ceased to exist, and when you exempt it from subjection to the laws of life, you are in every one of these steps overpassing the stern limits of observed phenomena to which your condition binds you down.' The evidence which might be offered for such a religion would be wholly passed over as unworthy of consideration, because the nature of the religion itself would be held to be in itself completely inadmissible.

When we pass from the hagiology of Positivism to its theology, the same observation forces itself upon the mind. Humanity, in the diversity of its operation, in the various institutions of its life, is to be the object of our worship. Humanity, as conceived by Positivism, is not the sum of human existence, but a selected and idealised derivation from that. It is the Great Being—the Supreme Being—terms too often and too persistently applied to it in Positive religion to allow of our treating them as metaphors. 'The Great Being is by its very nature the expression of the whole order of things—not merely of the order of man, but of the external world.' 'As a first step, we must define Humanity as the *whole* of human beings, past, present, and future. The word *whole* points out clearly that you must not take in all men, but those only who are really capable of assimilation in virtue of a real co-operation on their part in furthering the common good.'<sup>1</sup>

Such is our obtuseness that we should have thought that the word *whole* clearly pointed out that you *were* to take in all. But this severe strain to logic is evidently necessary, since, if Humanity were supposed to include the whole of mankind, it would include the worshipper himself among the rest; and it is evidently a primary necessity to a religion that it should present to us an object of worship distinct from ourselves. 'Humanity is in the main composed of subjective existences, of the dead not the living. They who testify their gratitude to her are in no way certain as a general rule of being finally incorporated in her.' But they ought to be certain of it if they aim at furthering the common good. What sort of Humanity is this into which a man has no certainty of being incorporated? But Comte's brilliant disciple, Mr. Harrison, goes further still than his master in severing Humanity from the individual man. We find in him no such hesitating ex-

<sup>1</sup> *Catechism*, p. 74.

pressions as 'in the main,' or 'not certain as a general rule,' expressions which might leave in the mind of the devotee some suspicion that being human he may perhaps be a part of Humanity. 'Every line,' says Mr. Harrison, 'of Comte's religion implies a power outside of each of us as well as outside of all of us, of which no one of us is part.'<sup>1</sup> 'It saves us from the moral welter which is the effect of training the heart to reject all sense of a Supreme Power and refuse all gratitude to Providence.'<sup>2</sup>

We really feel constrained to pause for a moment upon these last words, and ask in what sense Positive religion saves us from disbelief in Supreme Providence, and from the moral welter thence resulting. Comte explains this in a passage of his *Social Statics*, where the Providence of Positivism is contrasted with that of the old faith. He declares that we should be justified in offering the whole of our undivided feelings of gratitude to Humanity, 'even though there did exist a still higher Providence, the source of all the powers of our common mother.' 'The thanksgivings which were addressed to an imaginary being were for the most part simply acts of ingratitude towards Humanity, the only real author of the benefits received. In a word, our gratitude should be awakened by productions, not by materials; which latter have hardly ever a value worthy of our praises.'<sup>3</sup> Now seeing that the 'materials' which this possible higher Providence, presuming it to exist, provides for humanity comprehend every instrument within or without, with which it has done its work, including the nerves and sinews, the opportunities and inducements and the will to obey them, one does not feel able to think so little as Comte of the provision of materials: one fails indeed entirely to see what humanity has which it did not receive, that should give it a title to be called a Providence at all. But at the most it is a Providence which cannot provide its own materials, and which has (possibly at least) another Providence above it. It is therefore not a supreme Providence at all, nor able to deliver us from any welter into which disbelief of a Supreme Power or ingratitude to Providence may bring us. Plain people, when called to worship Humanity as a supreme Being, may very well object that in the first place it is not supreme, and in the next place it is not a Being.

However, we have digressed. Our primary object in quoting Mr. Harrison was to show that the Comtean Humanity

<sup>1</sup> *Contemporary Review*, November 1875, p. 1008.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 1010.

<sup>3</sup> Comte's *Social Statics*, by Harrison, pp. 51, 52.

is something not composed of mankind as we know mankind. None of us forms a part of it. And indeed Mr. J. S. Mill sums up his praise of Positive religion by endowing its supreme Being with the attribute of Infinity ; since, forming a collective existence without assignable beginning or end, it appeals to that feeling of the Infinite which is deeply rooted in human nature.<sup>1</sup> Precisely so. But the Infinite is the unconditioned : and the unconditioned is that region from which it is the chosen office of Positivism to warn us off as a place into which we have no business to stray. In plain terms, this infinite Being of which none of us forms a part, though it be called by the name Humanity, is really supernatural. It is not, and could not be, constructed out of the materials with which the knowable furnishes us. If we could ever suppose this worship established, we should have people making against it, with infinitely greater force, the appeal which Comte makes against the worship of God. We should have them saying that if God provides only materials, Humanity provides neither materials nor production. It is men and women who do the work of the world ; a Humanity of which men and women form no part, never did a stroke of it. And if Mr. Mill urges us to serve Humanity because Omnipotence does not require our services, we reply that, though men and women require our services, yet Humanity abstracted from them does not, nor should we in the least know how to render them to it if it did. Comtean Humanity is not made out of the knowable : for you cannot out of men as known, who are many, and subordinate, and weak, and derived, construct a Being who is one, great and supreme, without adding something to the compound which is not in the materials from which you profess to compound it.

There is, it seems, one answer, and only one, which can be made. It is this: that the deified Humanity of Positivism claims only a subjective existence—that is to say, exists only as an idea in the mind : that the mind is plainly capable of representing to itself such a conception ; that this power of the mind is a fact as much as any other fact in the world ; that it is able to supply to the idea of Humanity something more than is found in individual men, and is able to omit from its idea of Humanity any phenomena found in actual mankind which it does not desire to include ; and that we should not deny it the exercise of this power any more than we deny to Milton or Shakspeare the licence to frame their poetical conceptions or

<sup>1</sup> *Auguste Comte and Positivism*, p. 135.

refuse to recognise its possession of this power as being a very true and noble fact among the phenomena of the world.

Now it is quite true that this plea of mere subjectivity for Positive religion might be made. But let us mark in the first place how fatal an argument it would be for Positivism to use. The very principle of Positivism is the subordination of the subjective to the objective. To put away dreams and fancies and creations of the mind—and to substitute for them an honest and human recognition of facts as they are—this is the profession by means of which the philosophy makes its conquests. And altruism, or the duty of man to live for others and find his happiness in the happiness of others, is the moral principle which it regards as almost its own peculiar discovery and which it exalts to degrees of enthusiasm from which some of its own admirers (Mr. J. S. Mill among them) recoil. Now, in order to have altruism you postulate the real existence of those others whose feelings and whose welfare you identify with yourself. And so far as our ordinary duty to our immediate neighbours is concerned, this requisite is perfectly supplied. We know other people to exist, we know that they have feelings and are capable of happiness, and the whole task of altruism is to make these real beings objects of practical interest and devotion.

Now the old religions carried altruism into higher spheres. When we came to those secret and spiritual parts of life which have no immediate concern with other men, we still believed that we had to do with a real Being to whose will our own was to be subjected. The desires of this Being, his love, and his appeal for our love and service, were thoroughly realised, and they made the inward life of the spirit, the life of aspiration and prayer, quite of a piece with the outward life among mankind in this respect, that the one as well as the other was altruistic and called self out by the appeal of real existences which it knew around it. But the plea that the deity of Positivism has only a subjective existence will imply that, for it, this will be altogether changed. However altruistic it may be in living for the neighbours whom it owns, that inward life of meditation and prayer, and that public worship to which its founder attached such vast importance, cannot be altruistic, since there is no 'other' really existing being to whom it refers. Comte complains that in theological religion 'the worship and the régime were thoroughly heterogeneous. The one had God for its object, the other man.'<sup>1</sup> And he does not

<sup>1</sup> *Catechism*, p. 85.



perceive with what tremendous force the objection recoils upon his own system, of which the régime or method of life has man for its object, while the worship has no object at all, except one which has only a subjective existence. An object without an objective existence is a strange monster indeed. Altruism is quite spoiled by having to go through this bath of subjectivity. So that if Positive religion were our only refuge, it would have no reason to boast of rendering us further helps to subordinate the subjective to the objective. It would have to confess that whatever it might attempt to do in this way was by an evident necessity fatally inferior to that religion which it displaces, and which believing in an object of worship is able to reproach men, as true altruism ought to reproach them, when they worship that which their own fingers have made.

However, students of the Comtean religion will not, we think, find the plea that it is merely dealing with subjective conceptions to be advanced to excuse its excursions out of the knowable. Mr. Harrison, we have seen, claims that Comte consistently maintains the existence of 'a power outside of each of us, as well as outside of all of us, of which no one of us forms a part.' This is to convert the subjective conception into a really objective existence. And when this attempt is made, we are forced to call to mind the obvious principles which must govern us in proceeding to argue from the thoughts of our minds to existences outside of us. It is quite true, as Professor Mozley observes, that 'impressions are facts; that we seem to ourselves to see such facts about us is, a fact.'<sup>1</sup> But we do not seem to ourselves to see Comte's abstract Humanity about us; we are only capable of framing the idea of it. And in this as in all similar cases we have not the least right to treat our abstraction as a reality. 'Having once detached an aspect,' says Mr. Lewes, 'and considered it apart, the mind is prone to attach an objective reality to this separated aspect.' But 'when the abstraction expresses more than is given in the concretes,' the rule is that 'we may employ the abstraction to express all the concrete phenomena observed, and the unexplored remainder; but it is only the former that we must admit into our theoretical explanation.'<sup>2</sup> The only form in which science could allow the idea of an expurgated Humanity freed from the laws of life to be recognised would be as an idea, never as a reality truly existing.

But this restriction would quite unfit the conception for

<sup>1</sup> *University Sermons*, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> *Problems of Life and Mind*, vol. i. pp. 100, 277.



being the foundation of a religion. It is quite plain that if we could ever conceive Positive religion established and at work among mankind, it would come to the mass of its adherents as a revelation of something really existing, which they would never spontaneously have conceived. The guardian angels with their subjective existence, Humanity with its various forms of activity, would be named, imaged, and endowed with objectivity; and the religious condition of men under such a system would be indistinguishable from that which has often been seen in the world before, when men went on worshipping, as realities, abstractions of nature or of human life, which filled a void in the mind, but of whose genuine existence they did not ask themselves whether they had proof.

It is manifest that in Positivist religion there must needs be the use of the pure reason in framing a great general conception, and of the imagination, in endowing unseen beings and unexperienced facts with separate existence. Now these are the processes of mind which have been thought capable of enabling men to receive the revelation of a God and of an existence beyond this world. And because these processes of mind are different from those by which we know the sequence of phenomena in the world around us, the supposed revelation which employs them is rejected without examining the evidence, on the ground that man has no faculties which can be rightly so employed. But is it possible that faculties can be *incompetent* to receive a revelation of something as actually true, and yet competent to the more difficult feat of framing a conception which shall have right to be treated as if it were true? According to all rules of common sense, any restrictions which man is bound to place on his faith as to the sort of things which he can know as really existing will apply still more strongly to his faith in conceptions which he sets up for himself. And if it be unlawful to receive the revelation of a real supernatural, it must be more unlawful still to erect an imaginary supernatural. The latter process must have all the effect in turning the mind from its proper sphere of work, which the other can have, together with the additional defect of treating that as a truth which is confessedly not a truth at all.

At all events we beg the reader to consider whether Positive religion is constructed out of the knowable or not. To us it seems quite plain that it is not. Advocates of religion must feel a certain gratitude to Comte for the courageous honesty with which he faces the fact that man as he

exists must have a religion, and for his recognition of the further fact that this religion must be a real and positive thing, and must have a worship. But we feel more grateful still to him for the involuntary testimony which he bears to the fact that there is something in the very nature of man's religious wants which forbids the attempt to supply them out of the knowable. Comte saw well that love and kindness to the neighbours whom we know, even if carried so far as to be a ruling principle, could never be called a religion. It could never have that commanding place and that binding power which religion implies. No one could make a religion of humanity by setting aside Comte's doctrines as extravagances, and reducing his system to simple love of mankind. It becomes a very desirable social virtue among the rest of the virtues of men, but it ceases to have any claim to be called a religion. But in the process of elevation which was necessary in converting it into a religion we conceive there is not the least doubt that Comte wandered as far beyond the limits of carefully observed fact which the Positive philosophy imposes, as any previous religions can have done. He rejected their methods, yet he was, in the necessary course of human evolution, an heir by descent of their supernatural tendencies. And thus he becomes a witness to the principle that *religion must be founded on a revelation of the unknowable in selected knowable facts.*

'In the very denial of our power to learn what the Absolute is, there lies hid the assumption that it is; and the making this assumption proves that the Absolute has been present to the mind, not as a nothing, but as a something.' So writes Mr. Herbert Spencer.<sup>1</sup> And this impossibility under which the human mind labours to divest itself of belief in the reality of the absolute and unknowable may well account for Comte's involuntary introduction of it into a religion which claims to exclude it. But we turn now to Mr. Spencer's own method of dealing with the religious problem. It is simply this,—that there is for us a 'structure of definite consciousness of relations, which we call knowledge,' and 'an indefinite consciousness of existence transcending relations, which forms the essence of religion.'<sup>2</sup> Religion, then, according to Mr. Spencer, is 'the indefinite consciousness which we have of existence transcending relation.' The conviction 'that the existence of the world, with all which it contains and all that surrounds it, is a mystery ever press-

<sup>1</sup> *First Principles*, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 552.

ing for interpretation,' the belief 'in the omnipresence of something which passes comprehension,' are the conviction and belief which are common to all religions, and which the most unsparing criticism of each leaves unquestionable.<sup>1</sup> The reader will, we doubt not, be readily able to grasp this conception of religion as the acknowledgment of a mystery existing underneath everything, which we cannot know, and equally underneath everything that we do know. He will also perceive that this account of the matter is the direct converse of that of Comte; the one seeking to satisfy the religious sentiment out of that which we know without admitting the slightest admixture of that which we do not; while the other offers to it that which we do not know, entirely untinged by anything that is subject of definite knowledge.

There can be no doubt that all religions have contained this element of mystery. One needs but to read the article 'Theism' in Mr. Conway's *Sacred Anthology* to be convinced of that. And it is a conviction which has grown stronger as religions became purer. But when we are asked to define the unknowable in religion as that which transcends relations, we must entirely refuse, if the expression 'transcends relations' be understood to imply an incapacity of standing in any relation; and understood otherwise, the expression is a truism which no religion has denied. The essence of all religions has been the conviction that the unknowable, while transcending relations in this sense, that it does not cease to be unknowable in itself, yet stands in relations to man which can be known. No doubt this is a paradox: it has been felt and acknowledged to be such. S. Paul plainly means to call attention to this when he speaks of 'knowing' that which 'passeth knowledge.' 'I leave,' said a dying woman, 'the being which is present to me, and I take refuge in the unknown Being of God.'<sup>2</sup> But the very word religion itself, denoting as it does a binding power, necessarily denotes something which must have relations as many and as strict as the various principles which it is to bind in one. Thinking over the history of religions, we perceive beyond question that what would have remained of them if their objects were supposed to be placed out of relation to man would have been, not a concentrated essence, but simply nothing at all. Can you pray to, can you worship, can you obey that which has no relation to you? And what religion can there be without

<sup>1</sup> *First Principles*, pp. 44, 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Revival of Priestly Life in France*, p. 77

these acts? As an historical account of what religion has essentially been, this statement cannot for a moment be accepted.

It appears equally incapable of affording a basis for the reconciliation of science and religion. Mr. Spencer shows, in the early chapters of his *First Principles*, that religion has always included a belief in the unknowable; yet without affording any proof of the assertion that this belief alone has constituted the essence of religion. He then proceeds, with astonishing knowledge and grasp of mind, to prove that science leads us back in every direction to the unknowable. What he has then really done, is to place religion and science in parallel positions, each containing a knowable element and each an unknowable. It is not more certain that science contains an element of mystery than it is that religion contains an element of knowledge. What kind of justice is there, then, in assigning the whole knowable to one, and bidding the other to depart, content with a domain in cloudland, which is by the very hypothesis quite out of its reach? 'Ultimate scientific ideas turn out to be mere symbols of the actual, not cognitions of it'—'symbols utterly without resemblance to that for which they stand.'<sup>1</sup> We should be sorry to demand of science such an admission, since a symbol utterly without resemblance to that for which it stands seems to us not to be a symbol at all. But Mr. Spencer, having thus reduced the symbols of science and of religion to the same condition of incapacity to represent the mystery which underlies them, bids science continue to use her symbols with all confidence, and religion to disuse hers, or only continue to use them with a consciousness of absolute untruthfulness. We can find no reconciliation in such a 'one-sided reciprocity' as this.

However, we desire to call the reader's still closer attention to the inquiry to which we now proceed: namely, whether Mr. Spencer himself can make his conception of religion work. For if we should find that, setting out with so strong a conviction that religion is to be found in the pure unknowable, he is forced in practice to bring it into special connexion with knowable facts, we shall be able to claim him also as a powerful involuntary witness that the principle of revelation is indispensable to religion.

When he speaks, then, of the 'unknown Power manifested to us through all phenomena,'<sup>2</sup> we ask with confidence

<sup>1</sup> *First Principles*, pp. 68, 113.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 108.

whether there can be a *Power* which bears no relations to those things on which it exerts itself; and whether anything can be *manifested* without having relations to that *to* which, and to that *through* which, it is manifested? When he declares that 'by the necessary conditions of thought we are obliged to form a positive though vague consciousness of this which transcends distinct consciousness,' we ask whether (even if the epithet positive had been omitted) the term vague consciousness does not, in its way, express a kind of knowledge, and therefore a relation to the thing vaguely known, just as certainly as if the consciousness had been definite? In a very remarkable passage Mr. Spencer says<sup>1</sup> that—

'Very likely there will ever remain a need to give shape to that indefinite sense of an ultimate existence which forms the basis of our intelligence. We shall always be under the necessity of contemplating it as *some* mode of being; that is, of representing it to ourselves in *some* form of thought, however vague. And we shall not err in doing this, provided we treat every symbol which we thus frame as merely a symbol, utterly without resemblance to that for which it stands. Perhaps the constant formation of such symbols, and constant rejection of them as inadequate, may be hereafter, as it has hitherto been, a means of discipline. Perpetually to construct ideas requiring the utmost stretch of our faculties, and perpetually to find that such ideas must be abandoned as futile imaginations, may realise to us more fully than any other course the greatness of that which we vainly strive to grasp. Such efforts and failures may serve to maintain in our minds a due sense of the incommensurable difference between the conditioned and the unconditioned. By continually seeking to know, and being constantly thrown back with a deepened sense of the impossibility of knowing, we may keep alive the consciousness that it is alike our highest wisdom and our highest duty to regard that through which all things exist as the unknowable.'

The intellectual condition of man in respect to religion, if it were such as is depicted in this passage, would seem to us intolerable beyond description. It would be a punishment worse than that of the Danaïdes to be perpetually constructing religious ideas at the stretch of our faculties, which should not only afterwards turn out to be futile imaginations, but should be known at the very time we framed them to be symbols utterly without resemblance to that for which they stand. It would be evidently impossible under such conditions to drive men's minds to the task of framing expressions for the unknowable; they would cease to represent to themselves the ultimate existence under any form of thought at all. And this tendency to drive religious ideas out of the minds of all men

<sup>1</sup> *First Principles*, p. 113.

who do not care for unrealities condemns Mr. Spencer's system as perfectly inadequate to be a practical representation of the religious tradition of mankind. If any one requires a proof of this tendency of the system to complete religious negation, he may find it in the works of Mr. Spencer himself, in which there is never, so far as we are aware, the smallest attempt to represent the ultimate existence in a form of thought. With him it is never anything but the unknowable, which is certainly not a mode of being destined to be set aside in the future as too definite, and replaced by something more vague.

But the necessity which Mr. Spencer perceives, even though he does not act on it himself, of treating the ultimate existence as a form of thought, is a proof that he is aware that it is felt to be knowable. An unceasingly renewed attempt to express an idea is the treatment which we apply to subjects of knowledge which are very difficult, not that which we use in respect of things felt from the first to be out of the sphere of our conceptions. These we give up from the first: we despair of grappling with them. And when we do strive to express the idea of an object, that is in itself a demonstration that we feel it to have some side at least on which it can be grasped by the mind. Therefore the never-ceasing struggle with the idea of the ultimate existence to which Mr. Spencer condemns the mind is itself inconsistent with the theory that it is altogether unknowable. And so are the very expressions which he himself applies to that existence. He says that it 'forms the basis of our intelligence.' Is not our intelligence among things knowable? And is not the knowledge that the ultimate existence is the basis of our intelligence the knowledge of a *relation* which brings that ultimate existence itself into the region of the knowable? Thus, again, we are bidden to regard that through which all things exist as the unknowable. But it cannot, on the face of it, be wholly unknowable, since the knowledge that through it all things exist is the knowledge of a relation in which it stands to things; now that which stands in a known relation to known things is, so far, itself known.

Persons who have a right to judge declare Mr. Spencer's scientific grasp to be incomparably wider and truer than that of Comte. It is impossible to concede this superiority to his treatment of religion, although he himself distinctly recognises that 'this which we call religion must be treated as a subject of science.'<sup>1</sup> Comte observes the necessity that

<sup>1</sup> *First Principles*, p. 21.

religion should be comprehensible, and should have a practical régime and a worship ; and he tries manfully to supply the need. But as to the practical working of Cosmic religion we are left to our own conjectures, without any help from its author. Our conjecture, then, is that Cosmic religion in practical operation among masses of mankind would run either into a deadness of formal profession below that of the most depressed periods of earlier faiths, or into abject superstition and even idolatry. Let no scientific reader put aside the latter possibility as absurd until he has thought for a moment upon the grounds in human nature and in history on which it rests. Despair of knowing the ultimate existence accompanied by a perception that, for the satisfaction of the religious sentiment that existence must be embodied in some form of thought, is not a new condition of human belief. It has often prevailed. And wherever it has prevailed, ordinary men, freed from intellectual restraints by the presumption that religion is above or below the intellect, have multiplied the embodied forms of their worship, and degraded their religious sentiment into something as self-indulgent as sensuality. Meanwhile the more instructed have cynically looked on, or indulged themselves without leave of their intellect in some of the religious pleasures of the time just as they sometimes took a share in its lusts. Such times have been least of all times of religious progress or reform ; since why should any one trouble himself to show the falsehood of the forms in which religion is embodied, when it is certain that it must be embodied in some forms, and those which would succeed if the present were destroyed would be not a whit more capable than these of expressing that which is itself incapable of expression, and utterly unknowable ?

We find Cosmic religion carried a little, though only a little, further by Mr. Fiske than by Mr. Spencer :

‘Push our scientific research as far as we may, pursuing generalisation till all phenomena, past, present, and future, are embraced within a single formula, we shall never fathom this ultimate mystery : we shall be no nearer the comprehension of this omnipresent energy. Here science must ever reverently pause, acknowledging the presence of the mystery of mysteries. Here religion must ever hold sway, reminding us that from birth until death we are dependent on a Power to whose eternal decrees we must submit, to whose dispensations we must resign ourselves, and upon whose constancy we may persistently rely.’<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Cosmic Philosophy*, ii. 422.



Now let the reader judge whether every one of the following ten expressions as used in the above passage does not imply that the mystery is so far known to us as to stand in a known relation to us and we in a known relation to it—'energy,' 'presence,' 'dependent,' 'power,' 'decrees,' 'submit,' 'dispensations,' 'resign ourselves,' 'constancy,' 'rely.'

But the passage in which Mr. Fiske makes the nearest approach to showing us Cosmic religion in action appears to be the following :—

'When a law of nature has been violated (to use the current phrase) the religion of the scientific inquirer tells him that a sin has been committed ; and he is smitten with a sense of self-reproach no whit less keen than that experienced by his mediæval predecessor. The distinction between the scientific and the religious view of the breach of the law is thus apparent. When an act has been committed which must entail more or less misery either upon the individual himself or upon others, science merely recognises that there has been a breach of law ; but religion further declares that sin has been done, and there ensues a painful state of consciousness, which, as we must carefully note, is not due to selfish dread of suffering to be encountered (since similar suffering in a righteous cause would be met with a feeling of self-approval), but is made up chiefly of self-condemnation for the inexcusable infraction of nature's ordinance. Regarded as a product of physical evolution, this sense of sin, peculiar to the most highly developed organisms, is the analogue of the sense of pain shared in some degree by all organisms endowed with consciousness. The sense of sin, like the sense of pain, is normally the deterrent from actions which tend to diminish the completeness of the correspondence in which life consists. But while the sense of pain is common to those creatures whose incentives to action are purely selfish, the sense of sin can be possessed only by those creatures whose intelligence is sufficiently complex to enable them to recognise the relationship in which they stand to the omnipresent Power, and whose highest incentives to action are therefore quite impersonal.'<sup>1</sup>

Now when Mr. Fiske describes the capacity of religion as the recognition of 'the relationship in which we stand to the omnipresent Power,' he flatly contradicts Mr. Spencer's declaration that the essence of religion consists in 'the indefinite consciousness of an existence transcending relations.' For relationship is a reciprocal term, and we cannot be in relationship to that which transcends relationship to us. This observation alone would be sufficient to show the inability under which the Cosmic philosophers find themselves to preserve

<sup>1</sup> *Cosmic Philosophy*, ii. 456.

their unknowable in practice from connexion with things known. But it will be desirable to examine with a little further detail this exposition of the practical method of Cosmic religion.

Mr. Fiske, by prefixing in parenthesis the words 'to use the current phrase,' shows himself to be aware that the violation of a law of nature is something which in strictness Cosmic science cannot allow as possible. But the reader will observe that he not only uses the current phrase, but builds his whole explanation of religion upon a thorough acceptance of the ordinary belief that laws of nature can be violated by the will of man. Does he allow, then, that there are actions in human life which do not proceed from the operation of the laws of nature? If so, the capacity of miracles, which on this hypothesis is denied to that Power through which all things exist, is here ascribed to the will of man; and we have in this human will itself an instance of the unknowable, which lies beyond and above the laws of nature, interfering with these and making itself known and felt. In which case the Cosmic philosophy is surrendered.

But if, as the first principles of the doctrine of evolution seem to teach us, this freedom of human will is impossible, then all sinful acts, as well as all virtuous acts, are links in the iron chain of antecedent and consequent, necessary steps in the progressive adjustment of organism and environment. Now, speaking very carefully, we will not deny that as matter of fact persons holding such beliefs may feel pain when they have done wrong. But this pain must proceed, like the pain of one of the lower animals, from the actual want of correspondence between what they have done, and the demands of their happiness, or that of those they love, of the opinion of their society and of their inherited moral prepossessions. None of the pain can possibly come from a different relation which the Cosmist perceives his past sins to bear to the omnipresent Power from that which is borne by his past good deeds. Of both alike the unknowable is equally the source. For if it is deliberately to be stated that men reflecting on their sins can discern them to be infractions of the ordinance of the omnipresent Power, the inference is inevitable, that they can know and learn by experience what the ordinances of the omnipresent Power are; in which case that Power is not unknowable, but known. And not only is it known, but known to possess a virtuous moral character. Because evidently no one could regard infractions of the order of the unknowable, as such, to be sins unless the unknowable was

known to be virtuous and opposed to sin. If it were indeed purely unknowable it would be neither good nor bad, or might as well be bad as good : in either case its sanction imparts no quality of goodness whatever to any of our acts.

Similar reflections force themselves upon the mind when we try to apply Mr. Fiske's principles to our judgments of the acts of other men. Our judgments of others are inextricably interwoven with our judgments upon ourselves. We should have to commit sins in order to know how we shall feel when we have done them, if it were not that experience of the judgments which we and others have passed upon the acts of other men give us the necessary knowledge for application to ourselves. On whatever principles, then, we judge ourselves we must judge others ; and if with Mr. Fiske we appeal, when passing judgments on ourselves, not merely to our feeling of pain and to our experience of evil consequence, but also to the authority of the order of the unknowable, we must make the same appeal in regard to all the acts of other men which are known to us from history or observation. And we come to this, that in our survey of mankind and their acts we must regard their sins as not merely acts with painful consequences, but as infractions of the order of the unknowable, and their virtues as obedience to that order. And then Cosmic philosophy is committed to the old religious view of history in which the unknowable was thought to be *known by the special relation in which it stands to selected events* ; which is the formula of revelation. Any particular fact among the phenomena of the world which we know to stand in any special relation to the power which lies behind the things which are seen, is a revelation.

And as we before saw that Comte found it impossible to construct a religion purely out of things seen and known, without introducing the unknowable in connexion with these, so we have now shown the failure of the other school to construct a religion purely out of the unknowable without introducing the known in ascertainable relations to it. Both these religions are religions of revelation in every sense in which the principles of their common philosophy are opposed to revelation. And from the ability of the men whose works we have been considering, there is considerable reason to believe that the religion without revelation which they have failed in constructing cannot be constructed at all.

The consequence is, that it is impossible to satisfy the religious wants of mankind except by a revelation. The whole force of the great religious tradition of humanity is enlisted in

favour of this proposition—*the unknowable makes itself known*. And even the phrase 'religious tradition of humanity' is not strong enough; rather we should say 'the inherited formation of human nature, out of which it is impossible to conceive that any human being has the power to move.' This amounts to showing that man must have a revelation, unless his whole nature and history are to be confounded and set at civil war with his philosophical opinions in a miserable and indeed inconceivable manner. It is a proof of the truth of the idea of revelation in the highest sense of the word truth known to these philosophies, namely, a persistence in consciousness.

But for our parts we believe it safe to take from our premisses a step even beyond the actual fact that man must believe in a revelation. We hold it impossible to account for the universality of this conviction, that the unknowable makes itself known, except by the fact that it *has* made itself known. We use the term 'account for,' simply in the sense in which any Positivist might use it, as denoting the necessity under which the discovery of a fact lays him to suppose another fact adequate to produce it. Here is a conviction in men so widely spread and so striking as imperatively to demand the attention of philosophers. They frame hypotheses to account for it; and the very nature of these hypotheses themselves implies in their own despite the same conviction. We conceive the most reasonable account of this wonderful fact to be, that in some periods and series of events more than others, yet not in these alone, but in various ways at all times, and up to this day, among heathens, Jews, and Christians, believers and unbelievers, through inward facts of conscience and outward providences and acts of revelation, there has been experience of the truth that the unknowable comes down into things known.

---

## ART. IV.—PARISH RECORDS.

1. *The Marriage, Baptismal, and Burial Registers of the Collegiate Church or Abbey of S. Peter, Westminster.* Edited and Annotated by JOSEPH LEMUEL CHESTER. Private edition. (London: 1876.)
2. *The Parish of Ashburton in the 15th and 16th Centuries.* As it appears from Extracts from the Churchwardens' Accounts A.D. 1479-1580. With Notes and Comments. 1870.

DIFFERENT branches of knowledge bear fruits attractive to different minds; but there are few persons for whom History has not its charms,—especially the history of their own country, and more especially that of their own neighbourhood and parish.

If any one could exhibit a trustworthy series of dissolving views, which would enable us to say, 'Thus and thus our forefathers felt, lived, acted, at such and such a time; in such and such a state were our churches, houses, roads, and woods,' the exhibitor would not be in want of company, whether in towns, or in the country. The subject is so human as to be one of interest to all.

As it is, we are most of us glad of such fragmentary information as we can obtain. We listen to the archæologist whilst he tells us the history of the church and of the manor-house; to the antiquarian who exhibits ancient instruments, domestic or military; to the historian who describes the relations and condition of the lords of the soil and the peasantry; and to the poet who sings to us of the inner life, the feelings and motive principles of men.

Would that there had been a Tennysonian Ambrosius in every century, who not only felt, but wrote; and not only wrote, but was extant; one who could

'Delight himself with gossip and old wives,  
And feel no shame in saying,  
Rejoice, small man, in this small world of mine.'

For in truth there is no shame in observing and being deeply interested in those small worlds of our own, which, by similitude and correspondence, portray, and by accumulation make

up and constitute the great world so called, but which is in truth

‘The narrow realm whereon we move.’

Gray and Goldsmith with their polished numbers do not help us here. We must go to the old ballads edited by Hartshorne and to Piers Ploughman. Then, what a gap! Few and small are the stepping stones, until we find ourselves on the land of truth in the pages of Bloomfield and Crabbe, and Wordsworth’s *Churchyard on the Mountains*.

If we were Frenchmen, we should be wealthier; for their unwearied search into the charters and documents of the Seigneurs before the Revolution has thrown the light of the sun upon the habits and customs of the peasantry. That Revolution shows what men’s feelings were in France, just as the risings of Wat Tyler and Jack Cade throw light upon the thoughts and feelings of our country people under the yoke of feudalism, and as,—later on,—the rebellions of the west and east in the reign of Henry VIII., and the rising of the north in the time of Elizabeth, showed the opinion of the English peasants as to the spoliation and profanation which degraded the Reformation; but we would rather derive our knowledge from happier sources than political convulsions.

Our comparative want of such sources of information as the French enjoy is compensated for to some extent by our parish books, the registers and the churchwardens’ books. Alas! how few survive in their integrity!

‘Foliis ne carmina manda,

Ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis.’

Whilst our thoughts turn to these words of the Mantuan poet, it may be permitted to apply his account of the way in which the wars of the bees are allayed to the graves of the village Hampdens, of which Gray writes as a moralist only; but he is right. Many a constitutional battle has been fought on a small scale in a small village, but not with small energy and excitement; and they who fought now lie side by side in charity, their anger stilled like that of the bees:

‘Hi motus animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta  
Pulveris exigui jactu compressa quiescunt.’

Attention has long been attracted to parish books. Sir Ralph Bigland wrote upon them in 1766, and the reports of Archæological Societies have frequently contained copious extracts from them. The work, however, which dealt with them most thoroughly and has been of the greatest service is the

well-known *Registrum* of Mr. Burn, the second edition of which was published in 1862. We acknowledge at once and gratefully the large use which we shall make of this valuable work, and express our admiration of Colonel Chester's masterly book, which unhappily is not to be purchased by gold.

It appears that before the Reformation no parish books were kept, but entries were made of the marriages and burials of the great in missals and psalters. In religious houses also similar records were kept; but the poor were unmentioned. The monasteries kept other books, in which various matters of interest were recorded year after year. Their chartulary, leiger book, obituary, chronicle, &c. were store-houses of information; but few indeed have survived. They perished with the institutions to which they belonged, and were sold to shopkeepers or transported across the sea, or destroyed with missals, and breviaries, and libraries of valuable books.

Perhaps Cromwell desired to make some amends. Perhaps he had been pleased with the Registration instituted in Spain by the famous Cardinal Ximenes. Anyhow he procured an injunction in 1538 requiring registers to be kept.

There are indeed a few books extant of earlier date—an account-book at Barton Bleau, 1530, and registers of 1528 at Perlethorpe and Elsworth; a few also of 1534: but it is safe to say of our parish books, that they begin at 1538 at the earliest; and well for us indeed, if we find that they do so! In the official return made in 1830, it appeared that only 812 date from the above period. Between 1538 and 1558 survived 1822; between 1558 and 1603 were 2448.

It was from no want of legislation that such a loss of old books has arisen. Cromwell's injunction provided that a chest should be made for the books, with two keys, one for the parson, the other for the wardens; that every Sunday all the needful entries should be made in the presence of a warden; and a fine of 3s. 4d. was exacted for every omission. Reiterated directions were issued in the reigns of Edward VI. and of Elizabeth; and as a large number of books are dated 1558-9, it is fair to conclude that the latter sovereign effected a partial reform. Later on in her reign, 1597, a constitution of the province of Canterbury required a copy to be sent every year to the diocesan registry, and that entries should be read aloud once a year in church after morning or evening prayer. The same order was renewed under King James in 1603; and most of the old registers are not originals, but copies made and signed at the bottom of each page in attestation. Under the



commonwealth the clergy ceased to be concerned with registers, and every parish had its registrar, who was sworn before a Justice of the Peace. At the Restoration matters returned to their old footing. Subsequently, Parliament made some strange enactments, one of which incidentally ensured careful registration. It was the hero of Macaulay who, in order to prosecute the war with France, taxed every marriage, birth, and burial, and imposed 100*l.* fine on every act of neglect in recording these superfluities. In the reign of George III. 1783, a stamp duty of 3*d.* was imposed on every entry; a most mischievous measure for registers. In some parishes no entry was made for nearly two years in consequence. The Act was repealed in 1794.

In 1812 was passed George Rose's Act, requiring registers of baptisms to be kept in a separate book, imposing a penalty of fourteen years' transportation upon the crime of making a false entry or altering or defacing the register; ordering a list of all registers, their dates and hiatus, to be sent to the registrar of the diocese.

Finally, by the Act of 1836 the State became the registrar of births, and deaths, and marriages. The burial and baptismal registers alone are left to the Church. They are less and less resorted to for extracts, and the Church is perhaps only responsible to herself for the care or neglect of them.

It is not to be wondered at, however, that the Church has lost the registration of the country. It is the penalty of her carelessness. On a comparison of the dates of the Sussex registers made by Sir W. Burrell, between 1770 and 1780, and of those returned in 1831, the old registers of twenty-nine parishes had disappeared. Sometimes they rotted in an old chest, thrust aside into the greenest corner of a mildewed aisle. Sometimes they lay in a cupboard at the parsonage; often they were in the hands of a tradesman churchwarden, or clerk, or sexton. At Kirby Mallard the register, at first reported lost, was found lacerated behind the drawers of a back kitchen. At Otteringham the books prior to the eighteenth century were used for waste paper and for singeing a goose.

'You'd better have the leaf, sir,' has been the liberal offer of the custodian to the anxious investigator. The entry containing Addison's name was cut out at Milston, and given away as a present. At Great Wakering, during this century, a barber churchwarden used up the books to wipe his razors upon. At Hadleigh, in Essex, the most interesting book, which contains the signatures of the parishioners who signed

to the Protestation, 1641, the Solemn Vow and Covenant, also in 1641, the Solemn League and Covenant, 1644, was borrowed, not returned, sold at the death of the borrower with his other effects, bought by a person residing in a neighbouring parish, and by him kindly returned.<sup>1</sup> In spite of the change which has taken place in this matter, and the increased care of Church goods by the clergy and churchwardens, yet, considering that such care is not and never will be universal, and considering the risk of fire, and the effects of damp and the like, we must not blame those who, like the late Lord Romilly, wished all these precious books to be preserved in some national depository. It would seem that all such books should be carefully copied, and then that either the copy or the original should be left in the parish which is its home, and the other stored in some central place, more safe and accessible than the present.

The books of which we have been speaking are those which register marriages, births, and deaths. These were originally all contained in one volume; but such entries did not form the sole contents of that volume. In days when the book had no ruled pages directing the writer what and where to write, and implying that he was not to say more or elsewhere, the parson or whoever made the entry added somewhat occasionally; and also on spare leaves at the beginning, middle, or end of a book, observations were made and facts were recorded. It is this irregular information which renders them so interesting historically, and which connects them with our object in writing these pages.

In the registers of burial may be found such entries as these: 'a chrysom man child,' or a 'chrysomer,' that is to say, a child which died before the mother was church'd; for the chrysom, which was the fee of the priest, if the child lived, was buried with it, in case of its death. As late as 1688 an entry was made at Horndon on the Hill, 'for churching a woman 1s., or one yard of holland,'—that is to say, a chrysom.

Sometimes we meet with 'creatura,' 'creatura Christi,' or 'creature of Christ,' terms given in lieu of a name, if the

<sup>1</sup> This book was stolen, whilst the writer was curate, by burglars, who, when disappointed at missing the Church plate, emptied out the books from the chest into the Churchyard ditch. It was recovered for the second time to the parish. There is a quaint entry in the Brightstone accounts in the year 1702, 'for mending the churchwardens 6s.' They certainly wanted it, and if the clergy could have been done for the same price, it would have been money well spent.

child had received lay baptism, and died before it had been brought to the church. These entries are not known to exist after the Conference at Hampton Court, in which lay-baptism was checked.

At Maresfield a baptismal entry of 1551 runs thus—

‘Johannes Norman renatus est.’

At Hillingdon, towards the end of the seventeenth century, we find an infant entered—

‘Natus, renatus, denatus eodem die.’

Sometimes mention is made of the celestial bodies in connexion with the hour of birth, in order to assist an astrological computation.

The Puritan Christian names abound in particular districts—Sussex for one: Accepted, Elected, Faint-not, Stand-fast-on-high, Kill-sin, Fly-debate, Fight-the-good-fight, Replenish, Search-the-Scriptures, Small-hope, Seek-wisdom, Fly-fornication, and the like. Foundlings received the name of the patron saint of the parish in which they were found. In the register of the Temple Church between 1728 and 1755 no less than 104 foundlings received the name of Temple, or Templer. The seasons prohibited to matrimony are found stated in a Latin Triplet at Castle Hedingham and Little Bardfield. As late as the reign of Charles II. the following entry was made at S. Bemfleet: ‘To know the season when marriage is out of season.—It goeth out on February 7, and comes not in again till Low Sundaye. It goeth out again on Rogation Sundaye, and continueth out till Trinity Sunday, from which time ’tis in season until Advent, when it goeth out until January the 13th, and continueth on thence till February 7th.’

At Everton, Notts, the rule is thus expressed:—

‘Advent marriage doth deny,  
But Hilary gives thee liberty.  
Septuagesima says thee nay,  
Eight days from Easter says you may.  
Rogation bids thee to contain,  
But Trinity sets thee free again.’

But dispensations were granted. One is recorded at Twickenham in 1665.

There is a curious entry at Hockley. Two persons were married before the Justice of the Peace in 1656, under the

existing law, on October 17, and solemnised their wedding on the 23rd at the parsonage.

Sometimes the clergy wrote a short comment on the deceased in the burial register. These were not unfrequently either fulsome or irreverent and censorious. Our object does not require us to give any specimens.

It is not uncommon to find on the fly-leaves or at the end of a register a list of persons who had been excommunicated. In that of Barking, more than forty are recorded in the seventeenth century. These persons dying unrestored are mentioned at times as buried without service, not in the churchyard or in the extreme boundary of it.

Licences to eat flesh in Lent are often recorded. Those who were touched by the King for the evil were entered. Such notices occur in the register of Camberwell, Merton, Hambleton, and other parishes.

The following extracts from burial registers show how they serve to illustrate history :—

'*St. Andrew's, Holborn*, 1642. Nov. 21.—Ralph Walcott, Gent, died at Lord Brooke's house, Holborn, being shot with a bullet at ye fight near Brainford.

'*Eggescliffe*, 1644.—In this year there died of the plague in this towne one and twenty people : they are not all buried in the churchyard, and are not in the register.'

*Rumsay*.—The register mentions 400 deaths in 1665, caught by a coat made of cloth, which came from London.

'*St. Gregory by St. Paul's*.—Mr. Tracy, a yonge gent, who was slain in the upore between Paules and Ludgate, the eight of February, buried Feb. 10, 1600.'

In the same book persons slain near St. Paul's are mentioned in 1580, 1589, 1592, 1594, 1595.

In one of the Bermondsey books there is a most interesting entry which may be commended to the author of *Enoch Arden* :—

'The form of a solemn vow made betwixt a man and his wife, the man having been long absent, through which occasion the woman being married to another man, took her again as followeth.'

Then follows a renunciation and new vow, and the ceremony is attested by the parson and clerk.

The register of Sir Thomas Butler, vicar of Much Wenlock, was unhappily burned at Wynnstay in 1859, but the eminent Charles H. Hartshorne made extracts previously, which set us thinking what the feelings of good people must

have been during the transitions of the Reformation. For example, it narrates how, on November 7, 1547, the bones of the patron saint, S. Milburga, were burned at the entrance of the churchyard, with various images; how the old service was restored under Mary, September 3, 1553; and service in English re-introduced June 25, 1559.

Various singular facts are preserved from oblivion in the registers, as, for example, the discovery of a Roman villa in 1636 at Rodmarton.

In the register of Crowhurst, 1680, a comet, eclipses, unusual falls of snow, droughts, earthquakes, a parhelion, with an outline sketch and the like, find a place.

The price of corn is not forgotten: *e.g.* at St. Oswald's, Durham, 1587, wheat is said to have sold for 16s. 4d. per bushel, and next summer for only 3s. 4d.

The parish book, however, which contains the most information is that of the churchwardens' accounts. Happy is the parish which possesses such an inheritance of knowledge.

For example, the account-book—*quod sciam ineditus*—of Brighston, or Brighstone, or Bryghston, or Bryghteston, or Brixstone, or Brixton, Isle of Wight, begins in the year 1566, the older portion being lost, and contains abundance of information, which shall be presented in a classified form.

1. *Property. Cattle.*—These appear in 1566, but are more easily counted in 1570, when there were 10 cows, let out at 7d. each, and 134 sheep at 2d., surety being given by the lessees.

Whence came they? The inventory of church goods made for no good end in the sixth year of Edward VI. enumerates kine and sheep as the property of a brotherhood of the Trinity and a brotherhood of Allhallows. These for a wonder were not taken as spoil, and became a Church Sustentation Fund. It was resolved in vestry, 1576, that the rent should be raised to 2s. and 4d. a head respectively, but this was in advance of public feeling, and the old price continued until 1592, when the higher scale was adopted. The sheep disappear 1594; the cows probably 1637.

Articles which may have belonged to the guilds or which related to the church ales, and which were let out yearly: 'a tonne of brass, 2 yron broches' [*i.e.* spits], 2 brass potts, and platters varying in number. The last mention of the great tonne of brass is in 1572. The potts were sold for 2l. 6s., and the broches for 7s. 6d. in 1609. None of these were in the Edwardian Inventory. There were also some tenements,

not in the Edwardian Inventory, appearing, however, in 1568. These were let. They were small places close to the church, called in the accounts 'church-houses and y<sup>e</sup> bucher's shoppe.' They are probably the same as those called school-house and almshouse between 1615-24.

2. *Instrumenta Ecclesiæ*.—These are accounted for year by year by the outgoing to the incoming churchwardens.

The excuse for the Edwardian Inventory was that covetous persons in those disturbed days had made away with church furniture. This had been the case indeed at Brighston. A chalice had been sold, and vestments and brasses. There remained in the Inventory a chalice of silver gilt, a cope, two 'stiplebells, and one letell bell hanging in the Church collide the Saunte bell.' In the accounts, however, no chalice occurs until 1572, where it is called 'the communion cup' in 1574, 'with cover.' Probably the same vessel is called a 'silver boule and cover' in 1659, and again, surviving all the troubles, 1661. With this appears a 'cloth and carpet,' 1572 and forwards, the washing of the linen cloth being charged. New ones are bought, 1623, at a cost 2*l.* 12*s.*; and at the same time a pulpit cushion. The last was renewed, 1741, at a cost of 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* To these were added, in 1606, in consequence of the Canon, a bason and standing pot, a platter of pewter, 1633, and frequently a bottle, which cost 2*s.* 6*d.*, 1619. There is no mention of a pall, nor candlesticks, nor musical instruments, until an organ, which has already had two successors, was introduced in 1831. If there was a bass viol, &c., it did not belong to the parish. A surplice is mentioned, 1578, not in 1581, nor 1588. It reappears 1604. A new one was bought, 1662, at a cost of 3*l.* 2*s.*, and a new prayer-book at the same time.

*Books*.—These, in 1570, were a Bible, Communion Book, and two Psalters, the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the New Testament, in two volumes. To these, next year, were added 'iii Omely bokes and the bokes of Artycles and Canons;' after which date the usual entry is 'the ordinarie service boke' or 'bokes.' In 1626 we find 6*d.* paid for 'a booke of the King's Maties instructions to y<sup>e</sup> Byshops;' and prayers for a sickness, 1625, 1638, a fast 1628, and 'the Booke of Homyls,' 8*s.* 6*d.*, 1632.

'Poor man's box, 1609. The statutes hanging in the church, 2*s.* 6*d.*, 1608, in which year the accounts began to be kept between lines ruled for the figures.

The Sans bell was accounted for until 1594, when it disappeared. The two old bells remained, but were recast, and a

new one added, 1610, another paid for, 1741, in memory of Admiral Vernon's capture of Portobello, and a fifth was made out of the church gun in this century ; so that three bells have been added since the reign of Edward VI., by a gradual process. A clock appears, 1614, causing constant expenses for repair, vanishing after 1635.

3. *Articles of War.*—'iii shefs of arrows,' 1569. These were erased, 1574. 'Six warre billes,' in the year of the Armada, 1588. They diminish gradually, after assuming the name of 'muster bills,' and disappear in 1637. Ten pikes appear, 1595, and vanish 1600, a drum 1626. The cannon kept in the island churches appears, 1610, called the 'church peace.' Powder and balls are a usual item. A new gun-house was made for it, 1625, whereas in the next parish the gun was kept at the west end of the south aisle, and an arch turned for entrance and exit. The repairs of the carriage of this gun and muster expenses are regular items. The gun is now one of the bells, and the gun-house which was attached to the north of the tower has been pulled down some thirty years ago.

4. *Income and Expenses.*—It has already been mentioned that the hire of church kine and sheep and vessels produced a yearly income ; but there was also a rate called the Sette. This is not always mentioned, nor the amount, until 1582, in which year the quarter's sette was 4*l.* 10*s.* 8*d.*, but no other quarter is mentioned. In 1609, six quarters' settes are 27*l.* 7*s.* 2*d.* In 1610 five amount to 22*l.* 15*s.* ; 1611, one, 4*l.* 11*s.* 2*d.* ; 1612, two, 15*l.* 2*s.* 4*d.* ; 1613, four, 18*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.* ; 1614, one, 4*l.* 11*s.* 2*d.* No sign of opposition appears in the books, but in the State Papers Car. I. vol. 288, No. 57 and 57 I. the churchwardens appeal to Archbishop Laud for redress. They had presented three rich parishioners, 1631, for not paying their 'auntient rates to that church,' and were prosecuted by the delinquents before the Surrogate, where they were cast. They then appealed to the Court of Audience of Canterbury ; and being nearly ruined, they appealed to the Privy Council, but could not get a hearing. In their great distress they applied to Laud, who gave an order to Sir John Lambe to confer with Dr. Mason and ascertain the merits of the case, and examine the costs, and 'to give them all expedition that they may not be tyred out and undone by tedious and vexatious suits for performing their dutye.'

Also the churchwardens received of the parishioners, 1570, 8*s.* 7*d.* for paying 'for y<sup>e</sup> communion bred and wyne,' and



this reappears for a time. Besides, they sometimes sold church goods, as has been seen; and in 1570, there is this entry: 'The pryce of an old canapie, 3s. 1642, the old Bible, 10s.' Moreover, a strange custom of receiving the money for burials prevailed. In 1595 they claimed and received 6s. 8d. for a burial. This is the present fee for the burial of a non-parishioner, but Mr. Wayte, the person of whom the money was claimed, lived at Wayte Court, near the church. Again, 1609, of the same family. In 1612, for two of one family, 8s. 4d. 1613, the burial of two residents is charged 6s. 8d. each; again in 1622, for one 6s. 8d.; also in 1623, 1626. In 1637, of Thomas Wavell, for the burial of his child in the church, 6s. 8d.; 1640, the same; 1642, burial in church. The paucity of such entries suggests that all these burials were in the church, but how the parish came to have the fees does not appear. The last instance occurs 1677. In that year there are two entries of 6s. 8d., both for burial in the church. Whatever the explanation of this strange payment to the parish may be, the grounds of it were probably weak; and, at any rate, the custom was either prohibited or died out.

In 1608, the churchwardens added to their general account 'the Communion money, 4l. 1s. 0½d. The parson, Thos. Curle, appended a remonstrance, saying that it was 'given for and to the only use of the poor and is to be distributed accordingly.' The money was repaid by instalments—at any rate, most of it. Now as to expenditure. The details of repairs and purchases are given with the prices. The visitation fees are recorded. Amongst these are 'the smoke farthinge, 2s. 4d., 1608, which is the first year in which the disbursements are entered. This, in 1627, becomes Pentecost money. The visitation dinner cost 11s. in 1608. In 1681, 1l. 18s.; 1686, 2l. This, probably, provoked the parish, for in 1689 the charge is 5s., 1691, 6s. Gradually it recovered to 1l., 1698, and 2l. 3s., 1700. It fell again, 1760, to 5s. for the rector, and 5s. for the two churchwardens. The ringers are paid for beer. Benches in the churchyard are charged, 1622, 1630. Musters are regularly paid for; quota to the gaol; repairs of schoolhouse and almshouse, 1624. A great deal of money was given away to wanderers; so that the churchwardens were forbidden by the parish to do this, 1641, 1661.

Perhaps this is the best place for the mention of briefs, which became so numerous at times as to exhaust the patience of the people, as the small amount of the contribu-

tions testifies. They were used in 1689, for Alresford, Southwark, bungay, bishop's Lavington, St. Jude, Shaldon, Stafford, Morpeth.<sup>1</sup>

In 1709, there were ten briefs, one for the Palatinate; in 1710, fourteen, one of which produced only 10½*d.*; in 1717, nine. The highest sum collected 2*s.* 2*d.*, the lowest for Penrith Church, 8*d.*; but what could be expected in answer to demands for country parishes, the very names of which were unknown to the poor Brighsoners? In 1719 there were fourteen briefs, and one, that for Hartlepool Church, produced 8*d.*, and for Hinstock Church, 6*d.* This is the lowest sum recorded, and what lower parochial contribution can be expected? But religion and politics could inspire liberality. Thus the Palatinate, 1709, obtained 1*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.*; and great poland and polish prussia, in 1717, received 17*s.* Another book informs us, by an irregular entry, that in 1668, 2*l.* 6*s.* 9*d.* was collected for St. Paul's, and, 1793, for the French clergy refugees, 4*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* We will conclude this subject of expenditure with the history of sparrows, first remarking that no rewards were given for killing foxes, which confirms the island tradition that these creatures were introduced later by sportsmen.

Sparrows then were paid for by the churchwardens out of church funds. In 1798-9, 348 dozen sparrow heads cost 4*l.* 7*s.* This item rose and rose, until in 1827 it reached a fourth of the church expenses; and next year 10*l.* 7*s.* 8½*d.*, which was more than a third.

‘A slaughter to be told in groans, not words,  
The very St. Bartholomew of birds.’

The last payment, in 1835, was 9*l.* 8*s.* 1½*d.*,<sup>2</sup> but, in that year, was passed the Sparrow emancipation act. It is written by the honoured hand of Samuel Wilberforce as the vestry minute, ‘It was resolved that the allowance for sparrows’ heads be discontinued.’

Wilberforce was beforehand with Longfellow. His shrewd sense and his love for God's creatures guided him aright. How he would have rejoiced to have read to the Brighstone farmers the poet's plea:—

<sup>1</sup> ‘Briefs were letters patent, giving license for a public collection in churches.’—Hook's *Church Dictionary*.

<sup>2</sup> Two inhabitants are living who confess, not only to having procured sparrows' heads from a distance, but to having pickled and presented the same heads at least twice: a consideration which will comfort the living benevolent without pain to the deceased ratepayer.

'You call them thieves and pillagers ; but know  
They are the winged wardens of your farms,  
Who from the corn-fields drive the insidious foe,  
And from your harvests keep a hundred harms.  
'How can I teach your children gentleness,  
And mercy to the weak, and reverence  
For life, which in its weakness or excess,  
Is still a gleam of God's omnipotence ?'

5. *Historical Notices*, which may fairly be conjoined with *ecclesiastical*. Visitations were regularly held, and the fees paid. Churchwardens existed from the first. Sidesmen appear first 1609, cease 1640; recur 1641, cease and reappear 1653, and then disappear. Overseers appear 1649; waywardens 1655. In the year 1640 occurs this entry: 'Laid out at Newport, when the commissioners sett about the clergie, 5s. 10d.' From 1643 to 1652 no accounts are entered; 1653 no charge for bread and wine; 1654 no accounts; 1655, no charge for bread and wine; 1656-1660 no accounts; 1661 no charge, as above; 1662, charge for bread and wine, new surplice and Prayer-Book, so that the Restoration did not produce its effects until that year. In 1653, until after February, children are entered as baptized; after that as born, until 1661. In 1656, those who could not write, instead of making a cross, used a triangle, or a pentagon. In the years 1627-30, the churchwardens, in relieving wanderers, gave to 'poor Swiss gentlemen or soldiers;' probably the relics of the Swiss force which took part in the Palatinate war, in which England concerned herself so unfortunately. There is an entry in 1633, 'for the maimed souldiers, 8s. 8d.,' and the same next year. The following entry, 1686, points to the rebellion of the Duke of Monmouth: 'Gave to a woman in y<sup>e</sup> church liten y<sup>t</sup> was plundered in rebellion, 2s. 6d.' The payments to the ringers are not without signification. Thus, 1655, 'for beere for the ringers, the 23 of May, 4s. 6d.' Also, 'the 5 of November' called elsewhere 'powder day.' In 1661 the churchwardens were forbidden in vestry to give any money to ringers. In 1679 beer was used and charged at the parish meeting. In 1692, the churchwardens gave beer to the ringers, 'when news came of the victory against the French fleet;' 1741, 'the rejoyseing day, when the King was proclaimed;' 1744, Oct. 11, 30, Nov. 5, Christmas, May 29, June 11, the ringers were treated.

6. *Spiritual Condition*.—One would be inclined to judge

favourably of a parish which, soon after the days of the locust and the palmer-worm, expended so much from time to time in substantial repairs to the church, and upon the bells. There are no statistics, however, nor could there well be any, as to the observance of holy days, daily prayer, and the like. Those which relate to the Eucharist are painful, but not peculiar. They are these. In 1608, the first year in which the disbursements are entered, there were three celebrations, namely, upon the Sunday before Easter, Easter, and Christmas. 1609, the same. Next year three, one in September, none at Christmas. 1611, five. 1613, two: Easter and Christmas. 1619, four. The celebration on Palm Sunday as well as Easter was the rule. In 1621 there seems to have been provision for a communion of the sick—'for bread and wine for goodwife Weale, 3*d*,' and again 1625. In 1626 there was a communion on Whitsunday and three more celebrations, including 'the feast of the Nativity.' This number continued with little variation until the accounts cease 1643, and when they recur, 1653, no mention is made of bread and wine; not even in 1661. In 1662 the entry is 'for first communion,' and 'for last communion.' 1676, Whitsunday and one other day. 1678-9, twice. From 1681 there were three celebrations, on Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday, and this probably became the rule. When Samuel Wilberforce became Rector, 1830, there were, as usual, three communions,<sup>1</sup> the cost of each 8*s*. 3*d*.—total 1*l*. 4*s*. 9*d*.; but next year the item for wine amounted to 2*l*. 10*s*., next year 1*l*. 12*s*., next 2*l*., and the annual cost was about 50*s*. The monthly communions had begun, probably in addition to Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday. The present parson, therefore, and perhaps his successor, must not be impatient if the people are slow to regard the Eucharist as the great act of worship, and to regard frequent reception as the necessary and blessed support of their souls.

And now is it too presumptuous to hope that the object of these remarks will be partially attained, namely, that some of the clergy will undertake to keep a chronicle of passing events and of facts concerning their parishes? There is no place in the regularly ruled columns of our registers for such casual remarks as our forefathers inserted in the informal old books of their days. The churchwardens' account-books contain entries of the amounts of Mr. So-and-so's bill, and nothing more. There is no volume in which can be entered

<sup>1</sup> It may here be mentioned that the united incumbencies of the two preceding Rectors had amounted to exactly a century.

records of fire, and flood, shipwreck,<sup>1</sup> drought, gifts to the church, the increase of services, communicants, alms, and numerous matters which may be useful as well as interesting to posterity. Partial and insufficient as ancient local records are, and few as are those which survive, there is now absolutely nothing to take their place, still less to do their work more thoroughly. How thankful we should be to be fully informed on these points : how sad we are that we know just so much and no more, or rather know so little ! Why, then, leave a legacy of regret and intellectual poverty to our successors, instead of rich stores of information, and a feast of valuable knowledge ? Why, then, should not the clergy procure a folio ledger, and in good writing, and with good ink, tersely and with self-restraint record the present for the benefit of the future ? They would find the work a continual pleasure, and if long life be a good, we heartily wish them the pleasure of reviewing at the close of a thirty or forty years' incumbency the good works which they have been permitted to promote, and to revive the tender interest of their youthful ministration.

Let us more perfectly do for posterity what our ancestors did in a measure for us, nor suffer the things which have been, and which form the common experience of mankind, to perish, as worthless ; but rather provide *μὴ γενομένα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξέλητα γένηται*.

#### ART. V.—MAGAZINE LITERATURE.

1. *Blackwood's Magazine*. (Blackwood, Edinburgh.)
2. *Chambers's Magazine*. (Chambers, Edinburgh.)
3. *Macmillan's Magazine*. (Macmillan.)
4. *Aunt Judy's Magazine*. (Bell.)
5. *The Monthly Packet*. (Mozley and Smith.)
6. *The Churchman's Companion*. (Masters.)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE appears to have been an original English growth. What the Hôtel de Rambouillet had done, half a century before, for France, that the *Spectator* did for

<sup>1</sup> The writer has had to borrow and to copy into his book a record of wrecks on his coast, kept by a fisherman's family, extending from 1746 to 1808.

England, and it was characteristic of the two nations that the agent in the one should be a *salon*, in the other a paper. Both raised, refined, and purified the public taste at a time when storms had subsided, and left a good deal of mud behind them, and both did so only by a certain stiff fastidiousness which made Frenchwomen *précieuses*, and Englishmen, prigs.

One Dr. Drake, in 1818, collected much curious information respecting these early periodicals, showing that the first idea sprang from Steele, and the practical execution is due to Addison, whose invention of the Club of the *Spectator* gave a dramatic variety to the letters and essays, and scope for the employment of many different hands. It is plain that an immense effect was produced on the turbid waters. Dr. Drake quotes from contemporary pamphlets evidence that the whole current of thought was affected :

'All the pulpit discourses of a year scarce produce half the good that flowed from the *Spectator* of a day. . . . These writings have set all our wits and men of letters on a new way of thinking, of which they had but little or no notion before. Every one of them writes and thinks much more justly than they did some time since.'

The circulation amounted to 20,000 a day, and reached even to the Highlands (and this in the days of roads 'before they were made'), and were read with the news of the week by grave politicians, who met on Sunday evenings 'to arrange the affairs of the nation.'

Indeed, the Saturday papers in the *Spectator* are meant to be directly religious treatises. To us they look very flat, dry, and 'fusionless,' just fit for the age that had driven out the Non-jurors, but they were written in all sincerity, and did their work in keeping up the recognition of religion among the 'wits,' who gave their tone to the thought of the country. Nor must we forget that we owe to Addison the resuscitation of some of the most beautiful hymns of a more earnest and gifted generation than his own. Many persons are amazed to find that 'The spacious firmament on high,' and 'When all Thy mercies, O my God,' are not Addison's, but Andrew Marvell's. There was wholesome training, too, in the contemplation of the model Old English gentleman, Sir Roger de Coverley, so faithfully attending his village church, and making the responses sonorously, even though he rebuked the idle in an equally loud voice, and was himself the chooser of the printed sermons from which the parson was to preach. And as we know, Addison so loved Sir Roger, that, as

Cervantes did by Don Quixote, he slew him with his own hand to save him from being murdered by others.

It was the *Spectator*, too, that made Milton the fashion, and, by disinterring 'Chevy Chase,' began that delight in ballad lore which Johnson in vain ridiculed, and which bred our chief romantic literature and antiquarianism.

The correspondence afforded a ready lash for the many follies, foibles, and impertinences of the day. Letters on assumptions in manners and dress, complaints of my Lady's caprices from my Lady's own woman, pictures of life with the masculine lady of the time, or the gentleman too much devoted to the arts of the kitchen, cannot fail to amuse anyone who dips into the long rows of little brown volumes which range along the uppermost shelves of old libraries, by showing how unlike our own were the manners, how like the natures of our forefathers and foremothers.

France, Germany, and Holland had soon *Spectators* of their own, and at home Dr. Drake enumerates no less than thirty of the like papers before the era of the *Rambler*. It is curious to find that one of these was called the *Free Thinker*, not by any means in the present sense of the word, at least, so we hope, for it numbered an Archbishop of Armagh and a Bishop of Rochester among the contributors to its 'elegant fictions,' and was conducted by that Ambrose Philips, whose poems on aristocratic babies and 'Silly swains and yet more silly sheep' assisted in lowering 'silly' from its Miltonic sense of 'selig,' blessed; and whose nickname enriched the language with the adjective 'namby-pamby.' No wonder the *Free Thinker* did not thrive.

In truth the *Spectator* was a daily paper, and with all its class was more like a single article from one of our weekly papers, such as the *Saturday Review* or the *Athenæum*, than the Magazines which are its numerous progeny.

We have had the curiosity to look out the word Magazine in our Johnson and our Webster. It appears that the word comes from the Arabic *Makhzan*, a granary, whence the Spanish *Almacén*, the French *Magasin*, and our Magazines, which were almost always of corn or of ammunition, until Edward Cave, in 1731, adopted the word as a title for his monthly paper, the now venerable *Gentleman's Magazine*. In 1755, Johnson, with evident reluctance, adds to the original definition: 'Of late this word has signified a miscellaneous pamphlet, from a periodical miscellany named the *Gentleman's Magazine*,' and now after a century, that peculiar affectation, which makes second-rate English people like to



discard common words, has overthrown this sensible term, and when we go to inquire for our Magazines, the shopman stares as if we uttered a vulgarism, and reproachfully says, 'Your serials, sir?'—Periodicals, which first began the evil custom of turning an adjective into a substantive, having in the meantime fallen into disuse.

However, newspapers still head their critical column 'The Magazines,' and so far they are praiseworthy, though we have very considerable doubts whether the perpetual hasty and ephemeral criticism of the daily press is a wholesome stimulant to the subjects of it, often amounting as it does to a mere advertisement. To attempt a history of Magazine literature would be entirely beyond our bounds. All we can do is to mention what seems to us the chief stages in its course.

The *Gentleman's Magazine* was, as it professed, a storehouse of information of various kinds, not very brilliant, but useful and sensible; and the *Lady's*, which followed, was a curious collection of fashions, bad poetry, and worse novels, which, we think, was never in vogue with people of the higher classes, though it must have lived on many years, to judge by the accumulated volumes sometimes to be found in old inns or farm-houses.

It was not, however, till the lull that followed the downfall of Napoleon I. that there was leisure for much idle literature or any great facility for its transmission. Then it was that publishers began to start Magazines, such as the *Monthly* and *New Monthly*, in double columns of close printing, intended to supply the reader with a selection of fare, heavy or light, or both, as the case might be, for a whole month. The first which really attained any distinction was *Blackwood's*, in the hands of Professor Wilson. Reading his papers in cold blood after the lapse of forty years, it is difficult to realise the delight people felt in the symposia of Christopher North. We can only think of Mr. Pickwick, an evident parody of the great man, whose speeches were greeted with rapture, whether critical, political, humorous, or, we must now say, extravagant. When our elders tell us how eagerly they watched for *Blackwood* and revelled in the domineering sententiousness of Christopher and the broad Scotch jokes of the Shepherd, we turn to the old volumes, and stand amazed at the rampant thing that Toryism was in their day, and at the kind of wit that then went such a long way. And yet, in its kind, Christopher's is a wholesome, honest, outspoken sort of temper, always hearty in praise or blame, and never dealing with what

would soil the imagination: it is rough but not bitter, rude but not sneering. The spirit is that of a great boy, vehement in both likes and dislikes, crushing a noxious insect with sledge-hammer force, and then raving over the charms of his favourite pursuits. 'Maga' and 'Ebony,' and the like pet names are displayed to the public with the utmost simplicity, and the public accepted the confidence with equal cordiality.

With Wilson, *Blackwood* lost this distinctive feature of the *Noctes Ambrosianæ*, but it has continued to stand high in reputation, for good and sound critical papers and essays, and for fiction of a superior order—many of our best novels having first seen the light in its pages. There is no fear in taking up a number of Christopher North's beloved 'Maga' that we shall find anything for which to blush, or any attacks or sneers on what we hold most sacred.

There are almost as many periodicals as there are great publishers. There seems to be a necessity laid on every 'set' to have what it is now the fashion to call 'its organ': but as all kinds of fingers play on most of the organs in turn, there is nothing very distinctive left about them. It was one of the stock pieces of advice in books for young people forty years ago to avoid Reviews and Magazines, for fear of being made desultory. The Magazines were too strong, or the young people too careless, for the warning to be heeded, and perhaps its truth has been proved, for desultory the great proportion of us are, if by that we mean that there are comparatively very few readers who ever attempt a long many-volumed book, steadily work through a standard old history, or return again and again to an old favourite. One feels at times as if it would be a good thing to be shut up with half a dozen old books for a year, that one might read something through, instead of, as soon as one is settled into some solid book, being swept from it by the tide that sets in on the first of every month. Yet if there be a virtuous attempt to cling to the older friend and let the new comers drift by, we find ourselves left behind in household talk, in social conversation, and altogether out of the current of affairs. So, as the sheaf of periodicals comes in, we treat them as a naughty child does a dish of apples, taking a bite out of each in haste, ere they are passed on to some one else, or join the many-coloured pile in the cupboard. Some people do still steadily refuse to read a story in instalments, but the most part have cultivated a curious faculty in their minds, by which they keep eight or ten serial stories distinct from month to month, and never confuse their heroes and heroines.

Fiction is the inevitable feature of all Magazines alike; in some the wing meant to bear the solid part, as the thistle-down, the seed in others the chief element, only ballasted by a small amount of 'wadding.' We are far, however, from thinking this reign of Magazines altogether a misfortune. Many are thus enabled to read, who would never have had books within range of a more expensive kind. Subjects are ventilated as they could never be in separate pamphlets, and there is a ready circulation of useful discoveries or proposals. And the fiction itself gets more thoroughly read and commented on than it does in a complete form when it can be rapidly turned over and dismissed. The young Muse is especially obliged to the poet's corner of a Magazine, which enables her effusions to be put on their trial without that fatal venture, the publication of a volume. Altogether, the manufacturers of literature have reason to be grateful to the system, which, by lessening the risk of publishing their first essays in the craft, trains their 'prentice hands with some remuneration, and thus lifts them above that miserable dependence on patrons and publishers, of which Hogarth's 'Poor Author' is the embodiment.

On the other hand, the temptation is great of rushing unadvisedly into print. First beginners do not indeed find it very easy, and are apt to run the gauntlet through a series of rejections; but once established as a contributor, there is every temptation to slurring, hasty work, and in some cases to sacrificing the general artistic effect of a whole production to the desire to make a point in each number, and always to let the curtain fall at some climax. Then the graver articles are very apt to be the crude result of some dredging in a few of the usually neglected library shelves. The abstracts that would once have been made as a part of self-education are poured out as discoveries; and what, perhaps, is worse, the essays written during the working of the mind, and which are sometimes mere scum of fermentation, are sent forth to puzzle the world, and to commit the author to sentiments he would soon have outgrown. There are old stock subjects which come to the surface once or twice in every generation, such as the authorship of Junius, the Man in the Iron Mask, Caspar Hauser, and the Peter Botte Fountain, which all seem to be regarded as the material of Magazines, and which happily come fresh to somebody.

Magazines, literary, improving, religious, juvenile, and amusing, there are in numbers, besides the serial papers devoted to some special purpose, of which there is no need

to take any notice here. Every one has probably an ideal of a Magazine, which might be carried out, if editors were infallible, and could also command perfect contributors, whose productions would never disappoint or run counter to all expectations, or turn out too long or too short. It is rather awkward for the public if the slumbers of all the Homers of a number take place at the same time, as they are too apt to do in the heats of August. Moreover, editors have relations and friends, ay, and friends' and relations' friends—people who, as Dickens, we think, describes it, expect you to accept an article because their wife's brother once lent your uncle an alpenstock.

The nearest approach to the ideal Magazine of the second order, that we remember, was *Sharpe's Magazine*, in those days when *Frank Fairleigh* predominated in its fiction, S. M. was the poet, and the other articles were thoroughly fresh and vigorous. It was a perfect feast to seize upon one of the numbers, but there seems to be some fatality on this class of Magazines intended to be popular. The fresh vigour evaporated, the character changed, people dropped it, and then it dropped. A serial of this class is avowedly much wanted, and has been often attempted, but never is able long to survive. One difficulty is illustrations, which are always needed to float such a Magazine, but more often swamp it by their expense. Even *Good Words*, which began vigorously, soon fell into the pathos of the perpetual reproduction of two lovers looking into each other's eyes, and employs artists so devoted to the existing style of dress that the country girl described as clad in the homeliest manner appears in the true 'tilted hat' and tightened garments of the period. And in the current number this December, the artist has been so palpably heedless of the story that the hair described in the line below as flowing, is shown in the woodcut rolled up. These may be trifles, but they show culpable heedlessness. *The Day of Rest*, and that infantine Magazine the *Peepshow*, also the *British Workman*, have the best woodcuts, partly because they eschew the sentimental style. But it is a strange fact that the Evangelical and semi-Dissenting Magazines have almost a monopoly of clever art in woodcuts. Yet we can hardly suppose it is owing to their having a larger circulation.

There is at this moment no perfectly satisfactory Magazine, that we know of, to send into the servants' hall after the first novelty, and then to pass on to the lending library. *Good Words* has not the brilliancy it had in the outset under its

original editor. This would not matter, nor would we even object to an inoffensive negativeness in its theology, but we have no security against such objectionable stories as Mrs. Edwardes' tale of *The Sylvestres*, dealing in French Fourierists, and the Rev. Llewellyn Davies has been known in his ardour for cremation to state that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is founded on some misunderstanding of S. Paul's words. It seems to us that the plan throughout has been the collecting authors of name and then leaving them entirely to their own devices—a plan working well for literary interest, but not for the edification of those who need guidance. It is a great pity the *People's Magazine* did not attain liveliness enough to be popular, and thus perished, probably through the contrary fault of not allowing freedom enough, and the *Leisure Hour* has at present a story seemingly intended to diffuse mistrust and party spirit. The *Day of Rest* has some excellent contributors—Hesba Stretton, whose stories are always successful, and Mr. Proctor for science; but there is a tone of semi-Dissent about some of its papers that prevents us from committing ignorant readers to it. The like is the case with *Evening Hours*, which has lapsed more into this tone since its nominal editor has been avowedly beyond the reach of exercising any supervision. Her letters from Port Natal are the best thing in the numbers; but that a name should be lent as editor when editorial work is impossible, seems to us a strange thing. We greatly need a really good Magazine of this kind, with fiction, always pure and sound, stirring and lively enough to command eager interest, and with good scientific and historical articles, really able sketches of scenes and places at home and abroad, and altogether such a collection as would command the interest of a larger class of readers. We do not want it to be a directly 'religious Magazine,' only that religious principle should underlie everything in it, and that truth, reverence, and decorum should always be attended to.

We have more directly religious Magazines in *Golden Hours*, the *Churchman's Companion*, and *Monthly Packet*, the first of which alone attempts art, and that not very high art. *Golden Hours* has often pleasant chapters of travel, and sensible papers on other subjects, but its tales are apt to be controversial, and the dread of Romanism seems to be their chief moral. The *Churchman's Companion* often has excellent articles in it, but its weak point is the religious sensationalism of most of its fiction. Religious is hardly the right word, for there is apt to be a great deal too much of minute detail of

ornament and ritual combined with a rather sickly sentiment. It is very unfortunate, for the ecclesiastical articles are often excellent, but the weakness and silliness of some of these tales absolutely prevent the book from being read by persons to whom the more solid papers would be most useful. The *Monthly Packet* has adapted itself from the first to the needs of young girls of the well-educated classes, and its best articles usually run on from number to number so long, that there is little to interest a person who takes up a number casually, though there is much in it very valuable to regular subscribers.

What we want is something like what *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal* has been, nay, we can almost say that it still is. It is full of short interesting articles, always bright, clever, and full of information, but perfectly colourless as to religion. The weak point is, as usual, in the tales, and as after all it is stories that form the chief training in morals of an immense portion of our population, it is of great importance that these should be high-minded and well-principled. And here it is that the avoidance of religious topics tells. No one can write of the great events of human life, such as are the topics of fiction, without shallowness and poorness, or else without passion and lawlessness, who has not the mingled soberness and earnestness given by religious principle. And no one so feeling, can long write good papers in which all reference to the highest motives is kept out of sight. Innocent and pure these novelettes in *Chambers's* always are, but the longer ones have a great tendency to vehement sensational adventures, and the shorter are little more than lively accounts of some small love-affair, some mistake of identity, some imaginary terror, and are forgotten as soon as read. However, take it for all in all, there is no entirely secular Magazine we could so gladly see occupying a spare moment as *Chambers's*. And this merit of doing no harm is no small one. Children's Magazines ought to thrive more than they do, considering the real delight they are. It was a bad sign when Mozley's excellent *Magazine for the Young* failed for want of support; *Aunt Judy*, with all her talent, has been forced to raise her price, yet she really commands first-class juvenile writing, and is much better than *Good Things*. The *Chatterbox* and the *Peep Show* are too slight for a thoughtful child, though excellent for a younger one.

We feel this keenly when we pass from these so-called 'popular Magazines' to the larger monthlies, which lie on drawing-room tables and on bookstalls at stations; the newer



ones shining in butterfly tints, the older ones preserving their ancient sober livery.

Here is the *Argosy*, over which we mourn. It began so well, with that curious story of *Shoemaker's Village*, so wonderfully picturing one of those self-grown clusters of houses where the British workman is seen in his true colours; also with *Robert Falconer*, one of the best of George MacDonald's tales, and with other thoughtful papers that made those earlier numbers valuable. But for the last six or eight years, it has changed its character, and become a vehicle for the regular sensational novel, sometimes by Mrs. Henry Wood, sometimes by an imitator, with the regular murder at the beginning, and all the millinery details in which that school delight. There was one story, called *Parkwater*, so disgusting that we cannot imagine how it could have been printed. The stories professing to be the Recollections of Johnnie Ludlow have a certain naïve charm of style, and the two or three characters who run through them all, the Squire, his wife and son, are so natural that we forget the improbability of a moderately peopled neighbourhood having supplied such a fund of startling experiences and strange mysteries. The other tales are generally of that flimsy style which seems as if there were some machine to turn them off—a pair of lovers, a tragic or a comic incident, death or marriage, all in half a dozen pages, to be glanced at and forgotten. Sometimes there is a tolerable bit of foreign scenery, sometimes a scrap of historical character, and the inevitable poem. *Voilà tout*.

The other monthlies of higher pretensions lose a good deal of individuality from the practice of engaging authors all round in turn to supply articles, so that it might be possible to run through the whole course. *London Society*, *Belgravia*, and *Tinsley's* all have much the same character, and are almost wholly devoted to novels, with the lightest and most unsubstantial wadding between. In general, the novels are of the sensational type, and are apt to deal with equivocal positions and unpleasant mysteries. We must, however, make an exception in favour of a tale called *Wooded and Married*, by Miss Rosa Nouchette Carey, which ran on for a good while in *Tinsley's*, and was a really beautiful story, with some fine characters in it.

None of these approach the brilliancy of *Household Words*, when Dickens was its editor, and when Mrs. Gaskell was contributing her delicious *Cranford*—perhaps one of the best specimens of feminine humour in the language for quiet grace and delicacy. Such contributors as these cannot be



called up at will; so it is not fair to complain of their absence!

But we do complain of the presence of what is painful and unwholesome, like the fiction we often find in the *Cornhill*. There is no want of ability here, nor of interest, but surely it is not well that a popular serial, which lies on all our tables, should be made the field for creating sympathy with a woman who wants to marry her brother-in-law, as in *Hannah*, for such a painful picture as begins the *Atonement of Leam Dundas*, and for that present story of *Carità*, in which Mrs. Oliphant, to our grief and indignation, has brought forward a piteous suicide to escape a lingering disease. The description is excellent, and we are shown how the vivacious, eager, self-indulgent woman, who has lived a life of refined amusement and vanity, is absolutely unable to accept the sentence that condemns her to a slow agony, and thinks of nothing but how to escape it, without apparently the least recollection of any over-ruling Power—without hope and without fear of aught beyond the present. Nor, so far, is there any condemnation of the terrible act, and whatever the sequel may disclose in the course of events, we cannot but think the promulgation of these earlier chapters unjustifiable. Did the author ask herself how they might affect some sufferer in the same circumstances, and what morbid suggestions they might carry with them? It is one of the further difficulties of conscientious Magazine writing, that the Nemesis deferred to the end of a long tale does not tell upon the earlier portions when they are first read and commented upon.

Perhaps we shall be told that conscientious Magazine writing is a 'goody' idea, exploded long ago! Well, we are content to accept the imputation. We do think that it is a fearful responsibility to scatter broadcast pictures of frivolity, passion, and temptation, if not of vice, and that those who eagerly read such descriptions, though it may be far from them to do such things, certainly 'take pleasure in those that do them.'

Of course we do not expect that all writing should necessarily be *virginibus puerisque*, though we believe that it is a fact that the highest and noblest class of mind, and therefore the most manly, shrinks with disgust from foul descriptions, as health turns from disease. Great tragedy must perforce be concerned with crime and passion, but to treat these as subjects for great poems, tracing out the moral retribution with stern poetical justice, is not like the morbid love of close painting of the details which bring the horrors as close to us

as if we were reading them in the newspaper. Or why should we have bits of history, told with evident zest, of people who are better forgotten, such as the Marquise de Verneuil? The *Cornhill* has had such admirable papers in it—Miss Thackeray's charming tales and many others, which we lovingly remember, that we regret the more the uncomfortable tone (to say no more of it) so many of its articles have lately assumed.

A serial tale, if at all powerful, takes more hold of the imagination than one published complete, because there is more suspense and more discussion, and thus an objectionable one does more mischief in this form. Moreover, when the evil is detected, people have become interested, and do not like to withdraw their subscriptions till they know the end. A little resolution in this matter and a little conscience about reading are much needed in the present day. If all right-minded heads of families refused to take in a book where there was one of these undesirable tales going on, the supply would fall off, for the taste of the market is consulted, and authors would not be actually told that they must strain for incidents and passions to which they are unequal, and can only describe by mounting on stilts of other people's.

There are also the partly political, partly literary Magazines, such as *Fraser's*, *Macmillan's*, *St. James's*, and the *Temple Bar*. In these the imaginative portion is more the wing to float the seed of thought than the *raison d'être*, and we think that their vigour as to social questions, both for evil and for good, has diminished since the *Contemporary* and *Fortnightly Reviews* have served as an arena. Papers on abuses or on charities find a home in *Macmillan*, and there is good criticism at times in all of them, but memorable articles do not very often occur, and the wadding is sometimes extensive, though now and then there breaks on us some really able enunciation put forth by a person who really has something to say, and says it with all his might, such as Miss Octavia Hill's occasional papers on the London poor, in *Macmillan*; but, on the whole, we think there is less force and variety in these serials than there was in their earlier days, and though their fiction is more guarded than in some others, it has not been of the first order of late.

We were all bewitched with Mr. Black's descriptions of scenery in the *Strange Adventures of a Phaeton*, and a *Princess of Thule*, and there are arch pictures of character that take the imagination for a time, but the stories themselves are apt to compress into something rather poor and unsatisfactory. Try to tell the outline of any one of them, apart from the

grace of manner, and it is amazing how little there is in them. Indeed we are at a loss to understand how so extravagant and absurd a character as *Madcap Violet* can have had such a run. There is nothing in her worthy of admiration, and she only attracts by a certain fun and dash. Is it a wholesome state of things when such a wild, reckless, insubordinate girl is held up as the subject of interest? And how can a firm of such high character admit an article ending as one on *German Cradle Songs* does in this December number? where we are told that the Christmas tree 'points to the day when religion, having ceased to be a dogma, will have become once more simple poetry, and as such, the common inheritance of the pure in heart and childlike in spirit.' We ask, is it fair on us and on our sons and daughters to scatter such anti-Christian aspirations in their way?

It is well that Magazines should exist, as a vehicle for expression on many topics which require less ephemeral treatment than can be given in a newspaper, and yet cannot well stand alone. Yet we think that the continual feeding on this kind of literature is not favourable. Everything is in scraps, they come round like the fare at a dinner-party, cut and garnished mouthfuls, while we never see the *pièces de résistance*, from which half the materials come, and we get into a habit of expecting everything to be thus made easy for us, so that some of us are no more able to cater for ourselves in a library, than we are to exercise the noble art of carving, once the mark of a well-bred man or woman.

Yet in the interest of the many who can read intelligently, and have small means of buying books, who need windows opened to them in the world present and past, and want freshness and variety, we would fain see what we have described as an ideal Magazine, and which a very little might make some of the existing ones.

At the same time we hold that much of the special mission of Magazines has been taken away by the general cheapness of standard books, and that the habit of dipping idly into them is a pernicious one. While each trusts to its serial tale to float it, and runs on just because people are accustomed to it, or want to see the end of the story, both the writer and reader are injured by the process. Would not even that beautiful story, *Off the Skelligs*, have been far better if it had been written as a whole, when it must have been less disjointed and better brought into keeping? And would not the idea of a complete and connected plot, such as we see in Miss Austen's novels, be less entirely beyond the conception of the present generation?

Hasty writing, without sense of responsibility in sending forth crudities, is the bane of the thinkers of our day, and we suspect that the abuse of Magazine publicity has much assisted in forming the habit. What seems indeed to be most needed in all concerned with light literature, is—we are sorry to say it—a conscience, and a sense that a written sentence is even more potent for good or evil than a spoken sentence. This seems a self-evident fact; and yet, alas! how many there are who think nothing of perplexing others with their own troubled and vague theories. And how many more who seem to have no dread of pollution to the mind from what they read to pass away an idle hour!

---

#### ART. VI.—THE FIRST NAPOLEON.

1. *Correspondance de Napoléon I<sup>r</sup>*. Publiée par ordre de Napoleon III. Lettres XXVIII. Vols. Œuvres de Ste. Hélène, etc. IV. Vols. 32 Vols. 1858-70.
2. *Histoire de Napoléon I<sup>r</sup>*. Par P. LANFREY. 5 Vols. 6<sup>me</sup> Edition. 1870.
3. *Histoire et Mémoires*. Par le Général Cte. de SÉGUR. 7 Vols. 1873.

RASH as in most cases must be any attempt to predict the future, it is nevertheless not unsafe to prophesy that the career of the first Napoleon must for ever continue one of the most striking portions of the history of modern Europe. The splendour of his achievements, the height to which he rose, the suddenness and completeness of his fall, all combine to promise him an immunity from that oblivion in which the lapse of ages buries the memories of so many whom their contemporaries regarded with admiration. Nor will those who may hereafter seek to learn the truth concerning him have any reason to complain of lack of materials for forming their judgment. Their difficulty will rather be to sift what has been so prodigally laid before them: a task of unusual difficulty, since those who knew most of the great Conqueror and Emperor are not, speaking generally, those to whom it is possible to accord the greatest confidence. He would indeed be audacious in his credulity who should pin his faith in

every instance on the records left us by De Bourrienne, Savary, Mdme. d'Abrantès, Las Cases, or Montholon, or who should even conceive that he could at least rely on statements made by the hero himself.

But since the appearance of the last of these works, fresh and important light has been thrown on Napoleon's character by the three publications whose titles stand at the head of this article. The Correspondence, occupying twenty-eight bulky volumes, is not indeed quite all that it professes to be. It is but too plain that the hand of the expurgator has been at work, and that many letters and despatches have been suppressed, even though, or, it may be thought, because, they related to transactions of special interest. But if some documents are omitted which we should have greatly desired to see, it may be taken for granted that nothing has been inserted which is not the genuine production of the Imperial pen : that no one has put words into the writer's mouth which did not proceed from it : and that, on those subjects on which the editor has permitted him to speak, we have his genuine utterances, the exposition of his real feelings and motives, or, at all events, of those which he desired to have generally accepted as such.<sup>1</sup> And in this point of view the four last volumes of the series, those which contain the works which he wrote at St. Helena, are little less interesting than his Correspondence. They contain, among other things, his own narrative of some of his more important campaigns ; of his conduct and views in the revolutions of Vendémiaire and Brumaire, and on other occasions of political importance ; and thus, while his letters show his opinions as they were at the moment of action, these later and more deliberate writings set before us his mature judgment on the different transactions, formed and adhered to after the event, with the opinion which he expected or desired posterity also to adopt concerning them.

The two Memoirs, by M. Lanfrey and the Count de Ségur, are deserving of the more attentive study, from the opposite and conflicting views of his character which they present. Recent occurrences in his adopted country have raised up

<sup>1</sup> M. Lanfrey, however, impugns even the genuineness of parts of this correspondence, so far as to express an opinion that more than one letter has been altered so as to make it agree with the Emperor's subsequent views, or with the colour which, while at St. Helena, he desired to give to one or two transactions. And in more than one instance he certainly seems to have proved that the dates attached to the letters cannot possibly be accurate.

greater obstacles than ever to an impartial consideration of it. Amid the strife of parties, which rages there at this day almost as vehemently as eighty years ago, his name is still the war-cry of one section, and consequently provokes the fiercest hostility of others. If those who venerate the old traditions of military glory still look back with pride to the triumphs of Marengo, Jena, and Friedland, and give the allegiance of their hearts to the representative of him who achieved them, on the other hand, both those who hope to see the ancient monarchy re-established under its legitimate line of princes, and those also who believe in the possibility of a durable Republic, feel alike concerned to decry his genius and renown: they dwell upon the defects in his disposition; they point to the gloom and disasters of his later days as the heavy price paid by the nation for the glory acquired by himself in his earlier campaigns. Still smarting under Sédan, they find its prototype, and, in some degree, its parent in Montmartre and Waterloo.

Each of these feelings is represented in one or the other of the works before us. M. Lanfrey, whom his contributions to the democratic portion of the press have raised to a position of some influence in the French Senate, is an ardent admirer of the Revolution of 1789. He has persuaded himself that the aims of its first promoters are but a development of the principles of the religious Reformation of the sixteenth, and of the English Revolution of the seventeenth century. And he pursues with a bitterness as keen as if excited by some personal injury the memory of the man who made the successes of the self-styled champions of liberty, such as they were, a stepping-stone to a far more vigorous and comprehensive despotism than even Louis XIV. had ever been able to establish. With this feeling he examines every incident in Napoleon's career with merciless scrutiny; not only passing over none of his evil deeds, and making allowance for none of his defects, but criticising with great severity more than one of his most successful military operations; and at times even attributing to unworthy motives actions which have generally been regarded with warm approval: as when, to give a single instance, in the liberal terms which he granted to Wurmser at Mantua, and in the forbearance with which he kept himself out of sight when the veteran quitted the fortress which he had defended so gallantly, his biographer sees, not an appreciative generosity and delicacy, but 'too much disdain for the vanquished to have been inspired by real greatness of mind'—(i. 205.) It must be added, that M.

Lanfrey is not as scrupulous as so rigorous a critic of others should be in citing his authorities accurately. In quoting from Napoleon's Letters he is so careless as to introduce more than once words which convey a meaning that perhaps was in the writer's head, but which certainly did not proceed from his pen; not reflecting that such very lax practice can hardly fail to throw a doubt on the fairness of his strictures in other matters.

The Count de Ségur takes a very opposite line. A member of a noble house, distinguished in more than one generation for military and civil ability, and just emerging from boyhood when the admiration of the whole country, and indeed of all Europe, was excited by the brilliancy of the campaigns of 1796-7, he caught the warlike enthusiasm of the age; and, in spite of the Royalist traditions of his family, became a soldier in the Revolutionary army. As he says himself, 'the ascendancy of the genius of Napoleon soon completed his conversion'—(i. 55.) He enrolled himself in a body of volunteer cavalry for service about the person of the First Consul, which Count Mathieu Dumas was employed to organise under the title of 'The Hussars of Buonaparte;' and his manifest devotion soon obtained him marks of special favour from the First Consul, at that time solicitous above all things to reconcile the old nobility of the nation to his rule. Each succeeding triumph riveted the young soldier more to the side of the great leader who achieved it; and the recollection of his early attachment has guided his pen to the last. His work is not wholly new. Half a century has elapsed since he recorded the great enterprise of 1812, its partial accomplishment, its eventual failure, and unparalleled disasters, with a fidelity and vividness of colouring which have placed him beside our own Napier as a historian of warlike exploits. And that narrative is now incorporated with this memoir. In spirit and vigour, his new volumes fully equal that earlier portion; but we cannot conceal from ourselves that they are hardly entitled to as implicit a confidence. The Count, too, had caught something of the party spirit of the day; and he writes too much in the tone of an unshrinking advocate of his hero for all his statements or arguments to pass unquestioned.

The great crime of the execution of the Duc d'Enghien he is too honest to abstain from branding with the indignation it deserves. But we look almost in vain in his pages for a hint that any other action of Napoleon, whether as General, Consul, or Emperor, stands in need of explanation. Even the massacre of Jaffa he describes as a measure forced on him in spite of



his own reluctance by a council of war— 433.) As if he expected any one to believe that a man who in his first campaign had openly defied the Directory, his legitimate master, would submit to have a measure 'from which his soul revolted' forced on him by his own subordinate officers; and as if he were unaware that in his narrative of the campaign drawn up at St. Helena, Napoleon himself had discarded all such excuses, and mentioned it with intolerable callousness, and some falsehood of detail, as an ordinary incident of war. Other transactions of kindred character—the deaths of Pichegru and of Palm, for instance—he either passes over without mention, or he accepts concerning them the assertions of Napoleon himself as unquestionable. A still greater drawback to our implicit reliance on his work is his adoption of Napoleon's statements of the numbers of his own army in its different operations, and of those opposed to him, though on such subjects the Emperor's inveterate habit of falsification has been exposed over and over again by writers of all countries. His views of others are accepted with equally little hesitation. Moreau, of whom Napoleon's jealousy was notorious, is never mentioned without a sneer, while the ferocious and half-mad Paul wins a complimentary tribute to his lofty spirit by his accession to the Northern Confederacy, with which the First Consul hoped to cripple the resources of 'English malice.'

Still, in spite of the deductions which the exhibition of such a spirit compels us to make, the well-sustained vigour of the Count's narrative, and the sincere patriotism by which it is animated, make it the most trustworthy as well as the most attractive biography of the great Emperor which we either possess or can with any probability expect; while the contrast afforded by the two Memoirs may assist one who is a foreigner, and, as such, an adherent of no French party, in the endeavour to arrive at a fair and impartial estimate of the remarkable man who, throughout his whole life, was the bitterest enemy of this country, but to whom this country, more than any other, may afford to pardon his enmity, from a recollection of the failure of all his attempts to injure her, and of the degree in which those attempts contributed to his own overthrow.

We need not dwell upon the incidents of Napoleon's youth. As, when in the days of his power some friends were dilating on his descent from forefathers who had been illustrious in the middle ages, he cut them short by dating his pedigree from Montenotte, so we also may abstain from

anything beyond the most cursory mention of any previous events. His family had been for some generations settled in Corsica, and in 1778, when he was nine or ten years old, his father Charles Buonaparte, was sent to Paris as the chief member of a deputation of the nobles, to confer with the French Ministers. Corsica had but recently been annexed to France; and, as it was a part of the policy of the Government to conciliate men of the position of M. Buonaparte, the Secretary at War, the Count de Narbonne, gave him a nomination for his second son, Napoleon, to the military school at Brienne. At the end of seven years the young cadet obtained a commission as a lieutenant of artillery. But eight years more elapsed before he had any opportunity of distinguishing himself in his profession. And at one time he seemed inclined to seek fame in the paths of literature, and became the author of one or two political pamphlets, of which in later years he took some pains to suppress the memory.

Entering on life as he did at the commencement of the Revolution, he seems to have regarded its first development with mixed feelings. He was a vehement supporter of most of the reforms introduced in the National Assembly, became a member of the Club of the Friends of the Constitution, and took a leading part in the funeral honours which were paid to Mirabeau. But riot and disorder he at all times held in profound aversion; and being in the neighbourhood of the Tuileries on June 20, 1792, when Santerre and his followers had forced their way into the Palace, and the weak-minded Louis, unable to distinguish between dignified conciliation and unworthy submission, was degrading Royalty by placing on his brows the red cap, the emblem of sedition, he expressed to a young brother-officer the indignation with which such a spectacle filled him, in words loud enough to be heard, and which are worth preserving, as foreshowing the manner in which he was already resolved to act if ever he should be brought in contact with such a mob. 'What wretches!' he exclaimed. 'How could they let such a rabble enter the Palace? They should have swept away four or five hundred with cannon-shot, and the rest would fly fast enough.'<sup>1</sup>

We may well suppose that he regarded the further development of the Jacobin principles—the Terror, as the period of the Jacobin sway has ever since been called—with still greater disgust. Yet the first occasion which presented itself for the display of his professional abilities brought him into

<sup>1</sup> De Bourrienne, i. 49.

such close connexion with some influential members of the Jacobin party that he narrowly escaped being involved in its ruin. After the strange revolt of Toulon, a Board of Commissioners, consisting of Salicetti, a countryman of his own, a military officer named Barras, of noble birth but dissolute habits, and a younger brother of Robespierre, was sent down by the Convention to superintend the siege which was to recover that important arsenal. But the commanders of the besieging force were incompetent men, ignorant even of the range of artillery, and their operations had been a mere series of failures, when Captain Buonaparte, at that time without employment, paid Salicetti an accidental visit in the camp. He pointed out the errors which had hitherto prevented the success of the besiegers so clearly and forcibly, that Salicetti procured for him the command of the artillery, that he might carry out his own views. His skill and energy speedily changed the whole face of affairs. Toulon fell. And though Salicetti presently became jealous of him, Barras and the younger Robespierre conceived a high opinion of his courage and capacity. And when, in the spring of 1794, the latter returned to Paris to support his brother in the strife between the two Sections of the Jacobins which was fast ripening into an internecine quarrel, he entreated the young soldier to accompany him, offering him what Ségur calls the post of 'Lieutenant' to Maximilien; or, in other words, the command of the troops in the capital, which had hitherto been entrusted to the savage but unskilful Henriot. The offer seemed so tempting that his younger brother Lucien urged him to accept it: but Buonaparte had a clearer insight into the future, and into the secret feelings of the Parisians. Indifferent to human suffering as he more than once showed himself when any fancied interest of his own was at stake, he had no toleration for mere blood-thirstiness; and, in his reply to Lucien, while to a certain extent exculpating the younger brother, he vehemently denounced the elder Robespierre. 'Me to serve,' he cried, 'me to support such a man! Never. I know how useful I should be to him if I replaced that imbecile Henriot; but that is what I will not do. There is no honourable place for me but the army. Have patience. Some day I shall command Paris'—(S. i. 125.)

His biographer's comment on his words is that 'his refusal saved his own reputation, and France also.' His prediction of the power in store for him was amply fulfilled at a later day; but for some time few besides himself can have anticipated its realisation. After the fall of Toulon he was

indeed promoted to the rank of general of brigade, with the appointment of commander of the artillery in the Army of the Alps, under General Dumerbion. But, a few weeks after the overthrow of Robespierre, Salicetti denounced him as an adherent of the tyrant's party, which had not been entirely extinguished, and, in the revolutionary language, as 'suspected, and an enemy of the people.' He was arrested and sent as a prisoner to Paris, where accusation was still little less synonymous with condemnation than it had been. And, though the exertions of his friends procured his release and his reinstatement in his former post, the suspicion which Salicetti had fastened on his name still, in some degree, adhered to it; and at the beginning of 1795 he was instructed to quit Savoy, and to join the army in La Vendée as a brigadier of infantry. He refused to obey the latter portion of the order, on the ground that he was not an infantry officer; and those in power caught at his refusal as a plea for disgracing him. He was struck out of the list of artillery officers, without being placed on any other list; and was reduced to half pay at a time when full pay, being paid in paper money, did not afford the very highest officers bread to eat.<sup>1</sup> He came back to Paris, and lived there for some time in great poverty, forming various schemes to obtain a livelihood, but lacking means to carry out even the most moderate of them. At one time he conceived the idea of repairing to Constantinople, and seeking service in the Sultan's army.<sup>2</sup> At another he proposed to turn bookseller, but his first speculation in that trade proved a heavy loss—(S. i. 145.) He was almost at his wit's end. His views were now so moderate that he declared that his highest aspiration was for money enough to keep a gig; and as every other project failed, he began to consider whether he might not accomplish that end by obtaining a rich wife. His elder brother Joseph had lately married a Mademoiselle Clary, the daughter of a wealthy merchant of Marseilles; and she had a sister whose dowry might supply the modest competency which was now the limit of his wishes. But Désirée Clary was reserved for a destiny of a more durable grandeur than he could have given her. Had she become his wife she would have enjoyed a temporary crown; but she frowned on his suit, to marry his brother-officer, Bernadotte; and eventually, through one of

<sup>1</sup> At this time 750 francs in paper were only worth 20 in coin. Lanfrey (i. 60) and Alison (c. xix. § 40) affirm that 'in the course of this year the depreciation became such that 28,000 francs in paper were exchanged for a louis-d'or.'

<sup>2</sup> De Bourrienne, i. 72.

the strange revolutions of which the age was so fertile, to share the throne of Sweden with him, and to become the mother of a line of sovereigns.

Meanwhile, in other respects, events were working in favour of the young soldier, and even in the way of marriage fortune was preparing a compensation for his disappointment. The distress which was grinding him down was not confined to himself. All Paris, and indeed all France, was suffering equally, and the universal misery was preparing men's minds for a fresh revolution. The Convention was alive to its danger, and endeavoured to parry it by framing a new Constitution, to which neither the provincials nor the army were unfavourable; but which the Parisians regarded with suspicion as a fresh proof of the determination of the Convention to perpetuate the power from which during the last three years they had suffered so severely. The National Guard, which amounted to more than 30,000 men, sympathised with these views; and, relying on the support of this force, the citizens resolved to rise in insurrection, to crush the Convention by main force, and to take the settlement of affairs into their own hands.

The Convention had information of all their plans. Indeed, as had been the case in all former insurrections, no attempt was made to keep them secret. But it was not very obvious how the danger was to be encountered. Though the Assembly could confide in the support of the regular army, the force of that kind in the capital did not greatly exceed 5,000 men; and these, with a few batteries of artillery in the adjacent plain of Sablons, constituted their entire means of resistance. Still, weak as the numbers were, they might be sufficient if well handled; and the unscrupulous resolution which Barras had shown in the Thermidor of the previous year, decided the leaders of the Convention to offer him the command.

He accepted the post; but, as it was plain that the result of the contest would depend on the skilful use of the artillery, he requested the aid of Buonaparte as second in command. A day later he would have been unable to obtain his assistance; since Buonaparte had just received an appointment to reorganise the army in Holland, and was intending to quit Paris the very next morning. And, even as it was, an anecdote preserved by Ségur seems to show that, had he been left to his own choice, he would rather have fought against the Convention than in its service. A few hours before he had remarked to a brother officer that

'if the citizens would only place him at their head he would undertake in two hours to make them masters of the Tuileries, and to expel from the Palace all those wretches of the Convention.' His words may have been dictated, in Ségur's opinion, merely by the ambition to fill a prominent post at a critical moment, or perhaps by a recollection of the horrors which in former years had been perpetrated by the Convention, and by a natural desire to prevent the possibility of their renewal. At all events, it was probably this latter feeling that made him hesitate to accept the offer now made to him. He asked for time to deliberate. 'Three minutes,' replied Barras; and for the three minutes both stood looking at one another in silence. In the English rebellion of 1642 it had been said that to take no side at all was worse than even to take the wrong one. And apparently some such motive weighed with Buonaparte now. Even if the post proposed to him was not that which he would have preferred, it was the only one open to him. The three minutes elapsed. He accepted the command. Barras left all the arrangements to him, and he acted with unhesitating vigour and promptitude. As he told the Convention, 'minutes were hours,' but he was never a man to waste a minute—(S. i. 164.) He at once despatched an officer named Murat, whom, at a later day, he raised to a throne, to secure the artillery at Sablons and bring it into the gardens of the Tuileries; by daybreak he had placed the different batteries so as to command all the approaches to the Palace. And, when the insurrection began, as the insurgents advanced, he poured upon them a pitiless storm of shell and grape, which soon decided the contest. They fled so fast that the loss of life was comparatively small; and before evening order was restored.

The Directory was established. It had now to reward its champion. Barras, having become chief of the Directors, resigned his military appointment, the command of the Army of the Interior, as it was called; and procured it for his recent coadjutor. But such a post, which must either keep him out of actual warfare, or confine his energies to civil contests, if any more should arise, was far from satisfying the ambition of Buonaparte. It was equally far from meeting the requirements of the State. The Republic was at war on all sides: in Germany, in Spain, and in Italy. In the other quarters it had not been unsuccessful; but in the North of Italy a series of disasters had befallen its arms, and the feeling of dissatisfaction with its General, Schérer, was universal. A change was evidently required there; and Buonaparte, who



was perhaps alone in his perception how grand a field for exertion and distinction was open in that country, conceived an earnest desire to obtain the command, for which the experience of the state and character of the adjacent districts, which he had acquired while serving in the Alps, was some recommendation. And while his mind was full of this hope, chance threw him in the way of a lady who had great influence with Barras. Among the victims of the 'Terror' had been a General Beauharnais. He had left a widow and two children; and, while Buonaparte was General of the Army of the Interior, his son, a fine boy of twelve years old, came to him one day to beg that his father's sword might be returned to him. Buonaparte complied with the request, the very character of which commended it to his favour; and spoke to the child with such encouraging kindness that his mother visited him a few days afterwards to thank him for his notice of her boy. Madame Beauharnais was handsome and pre-eminently graceful and attractive. She had shared her husband's prison, but had been released at the fall of Robespierre; since which event she had been on terms of the closest intimacy with Barras. Her graces now made a deep impression on the young General, whose previous circumstances had not thrown him much into the society of ladies of high breeding. After a short acquaintance he sought her in marriage. She hesitated. Some of those who envied him had fixed on him the nickname of the General Vendémiaire; as if the only triumphs which he was qualified to gain were over citizen soldiers. And there were not wanting friends of her own to ridicule his somewhat wild appearance: his meagre face, and long hair hanging down on his shoulders; and, what was a greater objection still, his evident poverty. But she too was ambitious; he had an enthusiastic way of talking which persuaded her that he was capable of great deeds; and Barras promised her that, if she would consent to marry him, he would procure for him as her husband the command of the Army of Italy.<sup>1</sup> His argument prevailed; the lady consented; the Director kept his promise; the marriage took place on March 9, 1796; and, two days afterwards, the young commander-in-chief quitted his bride's arms to commence a campaign which was to lead to the attainment of a loftier destiny than either of them had as yet ventured to expect.

<sup>1</sup> Lanfrey, i. 78, quoting a letter of Joséphine herself. Ségur, who does not represent the transaction as such a positive bargain, admits that it was 'l'influence de Barras' which decided her—(i. 176.)



His campaign in Italy was the commencement of a new era in his life. In the view of the generality of readers it may almost be called the commencement of his life. At a later period we shall have to consider him as a ruler of a nation, and to endeavour to estimate the extent and character of his civil abilities. But for the next five years he is to be regarded simply as a soldier. And in some respects it is impossible to over-estimate his military genius. He came to the command of an army demoralised by recent failures; and, still more, by the absolute want of all the ordinary supplies in which it had been left by a Government which had neither money nor credit. Nothing can be conceived more wretched than the picture which Ségur draws of the troops, which, on April 5, met the General's eye when he reached Albenga, and began to prepare for offensive operations against the Austrian and the Sardinian armies, which, though not united, were acting on a system of mutual co-operation. In mere numbers, indeed, it was not greatly inferior to that of the enemy with which it was about to be engaged; but it was half-naked, and half-starved. The men's shoes were worn out. Many had parted with their under-clothing to get food or tobacco, and were ill-fitted to endure the piercing cold of a spring at the foot of the Alps. Even their accoutrements were deficient. Nearly half the infantry had no bayonets. The guns were harnessed to mangy mules. And, of the cavalry, whole squadrons dismounted to drag their lean horses after them, as being a service less toilsome and less perilous than that of riding them—(S. i. 196.) The inevitable consequence of this destitution was that the bonds of discipline were relaxed in every rank. Except on the field of battle there was no respect for authority. The field officers set as bad an example to the subalterns as the subalterns set to the privates; while the Generals had been compelled to connive at the irregularities of all, because they could neither feed nor pay them.

It was with such a force as this—so small, so unprovided, and so disorganised—that the young General in a few weeks inaugurated a new era in the art of war. As we have mentioned the difficulties which the condition of his soldiers imposed on him, it is fair again to follow Ségur when he points out the support which at the same time he derived from their character. The majority were men from the southern provinces, the flower of the veterans of the old royal army. They were not only full of patriotism and professional enthusiasm, but were eminently intelligent, quick at comprehend-

ing and appreciating the manœuvres of their chiefs; in many instances even not incompetent to make useful suggestions. Every historian has quoted an anecdote related by Buonaparte himself. As, on the eve of one of his battles, he was walking past some knots of men who were preparing their supper, a private accosted him with sufficient want of ceremony, 'General, you should do so and so.' 'What is that to you, you scamp! mind your own business,' was the reply; but the next day the General inquired anxiously, though in vain, for his counsellor; for, in fact, as he remarked in telling the story, the manœuvre which the man had suggested was the very one which he himself had resolved on adopting. Small as the army was—

'it was the most seasoned, the most devoted, the most intelligent, and the most richly endowed with military qualities that any one could desire. With such men, once elevated with that confidence in their chief which creates heroes in every country, and most especially in France, one may easily conceive that a first victory could not fail to be the pledge of many others'—(S. i. 178.)

And, if the mass was such, at least equal support was to be derived from the high military qualities of some of the Generals whom he found already in command: Berthier, whose unrivalled qualifications as a chief of the staff he was not slow to discern; Augereau, whose daring, personal strength, and pre-eminent skill as a swordsman had won and secured him a high place in the admiration of the soldiers; and Masséna, a warrior of far higher qualities, whom the enemies of France gradually learnt to consider as second only to Buonaparte himself. Indeed, these officers were not only so skilful, but so popular, that their young commander seems at first to have had some suspicion that their already established reputation might be attended with the drawback of indisposing them to that implicit obedience which he was resolved to exact,—of inclining them to pretend to some equality where he was resolved to assert the most absolute authority. He determined, therefore, to give them a lesson at their first meeting. And Ségur has left us an amusing picture of his reception of them when they visited him in his tent on his arrival at Albenga. He did not even touch his hat, but occupied himself for a minute or two in buckling on his sword in silence, and, when at last he did speak, his language was so brief and peremptory that even the insolent republicanism of Augereau felt rebuked and daunted; and, when they quitted the tent, he remarked to Masséna that he

could not comprehend how that little under-sized General had established such an ascendancy over him that he had felt overpowered by a single glance—(S. i. 194.)

Scarcely less favourable to him than the high qualities of his own army were the character, and, especially, the age, of the Generals opposed to him. Beaulieu, whom he first encountered, was seventy-five years old. Wurmsér, who was presently sent to replace him, was nearly eighty. And though both were officers of undoubted skill and courage, they had no longer the quickness of judgment necessary to encounter a novel system of tactics, nor physical strength to undergo the fatigues of a campaign; while, had they been more competent to the work before them than at their years it was possible that they should be, their exertions and skill would have been repeatedly baffled by the Aulic Council; which still maintained the mischievous power of interference with its Generals, which, above a century before, had provoked Montecuculi into resigning his command, and had nearly deprived the Empire of the services of the great Eugène.

With such troops, then, and against such antagonists, at the end of a week after his arrival at Albenga, Buonaparte prepared to commence his operations. His system may be described as specially marked by two leading features: extreme celerity of movement, and a concentration of the bulk of his force on one point; the latter depending on a minute calculation of the time required for every movement, so that the different divisions, however previously scattered, should find themselves united at the critical moment. Carried out with vigour and precision such as his, it was, in fact, a revolution in the art of war, and in a single week was proved to be such by its results. It had, however, the drawback of making demands on the physical strength of the soldiers which no army could long support; least of all, one so ill supplied as his. And so it may be said to have borne with it from the first the seeds of eventual disaster. And, unhappily for his fame, it must be added that the novelty of his tactics was not the only novelty which he now introduced into the practice of war. Before putting his army in motion, he announced to it his objects and hopes in a proclamation which appealed, not to their highest feelings, but to their lowest passions:—

‘Soldiers!’ it said, ‘you are ill fed, and nearly naked. The Government owes you much, and can do nothing for you. Your patience and your courage do you honour, but they procure you

neither glory nor advantage. I am about to lead you into the most fertile plains of the world. You will find there great cities and rich provinces. You will find honour, glory, and riches. Soldiers of the army of Italy ! can you fail in courage ?'

The principle announced here animated the generality of his addresses to his soldiers throughout his entire career, and we cannot but feel that it deserves the unsparing condemnation with which Lanfrey visits it. As he points out (i. 83), no previous General of modern times had ever tried to excite his troops to brave actions by appeals to their covetousness, by promises of pillage. Since the commencement of the Revolutionary war, other Generals had held out to their soldiers, as their inducements to action, the honour of abolishing tyrannies, of extending liberty, of emancipating nations. Buonaparte was now pointing out to his, Italy, not as a country to deliver, but as a prey to be plundered. And, if the day should hereafter come when France should find the same principle applied by her enemies to herself, her eager adoption of it now deprived her of any right to complain when the fortune of war should have turned against her.

The first action now fought, though on a small scale, deserves remark, not only as being the first, but also as affording a very perfect exemplification of the new strategy. Beaulieu's line was so extended as to be specially open to an attack on some isolated portion of it ; and, in the hope of tempting him to spread it out still more widely, Buonaparte designedly left a redoubt close to the pass of Montenotte so weakly garrisoned as to dismay even his own lieutenants—(S. i. 200.) Beaulieu fell into the trap. On the afternoon of the 11th he attacked it in force ; but Colonel Rampon, who commanded it, held it with unflinching courage against his utmost efforts, though the garrison consisted of only 1,200 men, and the assailants were 10,000 ; and during the night Buonaparte brought up his different divisions from all sides to surround the Austrian column, which still occupied the ground in front of the redoubt, on which they intended to renew the attack the next morning. The weather, which was unusually stormy and dark, favoured his movements by concealing them ; but the sun shone brightly on the morning of the 12th, and revealed to the astonished Austrians Laharpe with one French division marching to attack them in front, Massena outflanking them on one side, Augereau pressing upon them on another, and the commander-in-chief himself cutting off their retreat. The battle, if a conflict under such circumstances can be called one, did not last long. After a brief struggle the

Austrians fled in confusion, leaving 2,000 prisoners and five guns in the hands of the French ; and the moral consequences of their defeat were far more important than the loss which they had sustained.

For there was not one French soldier who did not see in this day of Montenotte a sure presage of future triumphs. The intelligence which, as we have seen, Ségur eulogises as a remarkable characteristic of this army, enabled the troops to appreciate correctly the means by which the victory had been won ; the exact calculation of time and distance by which the divisions previously separated had been brought together at the precise moment at which they were required, and combined in an attack on the enemy which the very surprise rendered irresistible. It was not without reason that at a subsequent day the conqueror, on the throne which he had won, declared that his nobility dated from Montenotte.

It was even more characteristic of him, and more indicative of his future course, that on the same day he conducted himself as if he had another foe to combat besides Beaulieu. Salicetti, who was in the neighbourhood, hastened to congratulate him on his victory, and, with the air of one in authority, inquired what were his projects for the future. The General gave him a contemptuous look, and, without a single word of reply, turned his back on him—(S. i. 203.) If he was not already conscious of his strength, he at all events felt it sufficiently to embolden him to show that he was resolved to permit no interference on the part of the Directory ; that he would not even give them the opportunity of judging of his plans, far less of controlling them.

Beaulieu, whose centre had been pierced, was for a moment in uncertainty how to repair the damage, though his loss had not been such as to deprive him of the numerical superiority over the French. But Buonaparte was never in doubt. He did not lose an hour. The next day Augereau attacked and routed the Piedmontese army at Millesimo. On the 14th, Buonaparte himself gave the Austrians a second defeat at Dego, taking 3,000 more prisoners, and 13 more guns. And, on the 15th, a fourth day of battle in the same place was a fourth day of victory. There is no need to dilate on the brilliancy of these achievements : the mere dates speak for them with sufficient emphasis. The last engagements had definitively separated the Austrian and Piedmontese armies. In less than a week a fifth victory over the Sardinian General Colli at Mondovi finished the campaign as far as the King of Sardinia was concerned. He feared for the safety of his capital, and concluded a treaty

with the Republic, which left Buonaparte at leisure to direct all his subsequent efforts against the Austrians alone. We cannot wonder that he was elated; he declared that with such an army as his he could traverse Europe. And in a proclamation of thanks to his soldiers, he summed up their achievements in a few brief phrases, rightly judging that the barest enumeration of them was their best panegyric, any comment on which could but weaken its force:

‘In one fortnight,’ he told them, ‘they had gained six victories, had taken 21 standards, 50 guns, 15,000 prisoners, and many fortresses. They had made themselves masters of the richest part of Piedmont. Destitute of everything they themselves had supplied everything. They had gained battles without cannon; had crossed rivers without bridges; had made forced marches without shoes; had often bivouacked without bread to eat.’

These were great exploits: sufficient, as many would have deemed them, for the entire work of a campaign. In his eyes they were but the stepping-stones to others of greater magnitude. He concluded his proclamation by bidding his soldiers ‘not to think that they had done anything while anything yet remained to do.’<sup>1</sup> And in a despatch to the Directory he briefly sketched out the objects which he conceived now to be within his reach. He would drive Beaulieu across the Po; he would make himself master of Lombardy; in a month he would be in the Tyrol, and in concert with the army of the Rhine, would carry the war into Bavaria. After such a promise he could not afford to lose an hour. But, before proceeding against Beaulieu he spared a day or two to plunder some of the minor States of Northern Italy. From the beginning he had resolved to make the war support the war. His soldiers were still without supplies and without pay; and the readiest mode of obtaining them seemed to be to exact contributions from some of the small Duchies which were in alliance with Austria, but which Austria was unable to defend. He fell first on Parma. The Duke had sent an envoy to propose a treaty of peace. He compelled him to purchase it by the payment of a vast sum of money, and by furnishing supplies of all kinds, including horses for the cavalry; to which he added the cession of twenty of his finest pictures. A week or two afterwards he imposed similar terms on the Duke of Modena. The exaction of the works of art was, as he himself confesses, warranted by no parallel or

<sup>1</sup> He gives the whole proclamation in his *Campaigns of Italy*—*Corr.* xxix. p. 92.



precedent;<sup>1</sup> and it has been generally denounced as a flagrant and barbarous abuse of the rights of conquest. But it is significant of the different spirit in which the two biographers before us deal with his whole career, that Ségur merely states the circumstance as one that calls for no comment, while Lanfrey (i. 100) brands it as an outrage which, more than any other, contributed to implant in all other countries an indelible hatred of France.

These spoliations were the work of a few days. By the beginning of May he again brought Beaulieu to action; defeated him at Lodi, and on the 15th entered Milan in triumph.

In the latter years of his life he told his companions that the victory of Lodi was the event which first suggested to him the projects for his own aggrandisement which he eventually realised.<sup>2</sup> But Ségur finds indications of the same idea at a rather earlier date; pointing out that in his negotiations with the Sardinian envoys in April he had resumed the old forms of ceremony and courtesy which the Republicans in Paris had discarded, and seeing in the studied politeness of his language a foreshadowing of the establishment of a court of his own. His victory had not been unwelcome to the Milanese, who hated the Austrians, and rejoiced at the prospect of being now emancipated from the Imperial yoke; but, before Buonaparte quitted their city, they learnt that they were not to have their deliverance for nothing. He expelled the Austrian magistrates and established a municipal government; but he made the citizens buy their new privileges with a vast contribution of money, supplies, and works of art, telling them that 'liberty was worth paying for.' Again he addressed his soldiers in a spirit-stirring proclamation, which was in intention addressed to the whole nation as much as to themselves, praising them for their past exploits, and claiming their confidence in future wherever he might lead them. And indeed his services to the army and to the nation were not confined to his victories, brilliant as they were. He had begun to form a school of warriors, as Nelson a year or two afterwards boasted that he had done in the fleet,<sup>3</sup> and as, at a later period, Lord

<sup>1</sup> 'C'est le premier exemple de ce genre qu'on rencontre dans l'histoire moderne'—(*Corr.* xxix. p. 99.)

<sup>2</sup> *Mem. de St. Hélène*, par le Cte. de Las Cases, i. 193. *Récits de la Captivité, etc.*, par le Général Montholon, ii. 424.

<sup>3</sup> 'They are, and I glory in them, my darling children: they served in my school'—Letter to Lord Keith on the 'Capture of the Guillaume Tell,' April 8, 1800: *Desp.* iv. 226.



Grey praised Wellington for forming one in Spain capable themselves of leading armies to victory. And if we justly attribute some portion of his triumphs in later years at Austerlitz or Auerstadt to the brilliant support he received from his lieutenants, the same justice must remind us that it was he who had made them what they were, that the fruit which he gathered came from a tree which he himself had planted.

Meanwhile the news of his success excited different feelings in different classes in Paris. The populace in general, when they heard of victory after victory, and saw the colours of the beaten enemies carried in pomp through the streets, were unanimous in their exultation. But the Directory were not without fears that in making himself master of Italy he might make himself their master also, and they had reason for their apprehensions. If he had extricated them from great difficulties, if he had sent them not only standards and pictures, but vast sums of money, enabling them not only to carry on the government at home, but to pay the army of the Rhine, he had at the same time exhibited a decided resolution not to allow them to interfere with his military plans. He had opened negotiations without their authority, and had refused obedience to their positive commands. They had sent him an order to march against Rome, to which he had paid no attention. They now repeated the instruction, and announced to him that the army of Italy was to be divided, that he was to lead one division to the south, and that Kellermann with the other division was to continue the operations against Beaulieu. His answer showed his consciousness of his own strength and of their inability to dispense with him. He instantly resigned his command, and they had no choice but to recall their order. It was an acknowledgment that he was their master, and he displayed his feeling that it was such by fresh defiance of their instructions. He continued his operations against Beaulieu with greater vigour than ever, driving him from the Adda to the Mincio, from the Mincio to the Adige, and from the Adige into the Tyrol, taking prisoners, guns, and fortresses, till Mantua was the sole possession left to the Emperor in Italy; and having thus cleared Lombardy, he began to open negotiations with Venice, and at the same time sent detachments towards the south to overrun the States of the Church, and to overawe the Pope and the King of Naples. These objects were easily attained. The King sent envoys who were empowered to submit to all his demands. The Pope employed a Cardinal as his ambassador, who, according to Ségur, yielded even more readily than the

Neapolitan laymen to the ascendancy of 'the young hero.' He returned to his Holiness 'full of admiration' for him, even though he had only purchased peace by the surrender of Bologna, Ferrara, and Ancona, of nearly a million of money, and of 100 of the finest pictures and statues in Rome.

Meanwhile the Austrians made great exertions to recover their lost ground. They reinforced their army, and placed it under the command of Wurmser—a general of high reputation, but, as we have already mentioned, even older than Beaulieu. And before the end of the autumn they added a second army under General Alvinzi, who was, however, chiefly known as the commander in the unsuccessful campaign which, in co-operation with the Duke of York, the Empire had conducted in Holland two years before. Their united forces far outnumbered the French, though Buonaparte, in his despatches, and even in the annals of this war which he wrote at St. Helena, ridiculously exaggerates the disproportion. But their superiority of numbers proved of no avail, though it enabled them to inflict on him one decided defeat, and twice placed him in imminent danger of being taken prisoner. His lieutenants, indeed, were alarmed, and, with the single exception of Augereau, recommended him to retreat. But his calculations were not founded on numbers alone. He included in his estimate of chances the defects of the German system and character. If the hostile commanders were masters of the theory of their profession, on the other hand they were slow in decision and irresolute in action; sometimes, from want of caution, failing to reap the full advantage of any success which they might have gained; sometimes, from want of tenacity, converting a drawn battle into a defeat, or a defeat into an irreparable disaster. He resolved, therefore, to hold his ground; and throughout the summer and autumn battle followed battle in rapid succession. At this distance of time it is sufficient to mention the names of two: Arcola is memorable not only for the brilliant strategy by which he retrieved a defeat sustained three days before at Caldiero, and restored the courage of his soldiers which that event had greatly depressed;<sup>1</sup> memorable also for the personal gallantry displayed by himself, and for the proofs which his danger elicited of the enthusiastic attachment with which he had inspired all ranks of his army. Twenty years

<sup>1</sup> He admits the defeat: 'L'ennemi s'attribua, avec raison, la victoire,' and also the depressing influence which it had upon his army: 'L'affaire de Caldiero avait sensiblement abaissé le moral du soldat Français'—*Campagne d'Italie—Correspondance*, etc. xxix. p. 154-5.

afterwards he recorded the efforts made by his followers for his preservation with a gratitude which he rarely felt for any service ; calling it ' a day of military devotion,' and relating how at one crisis his grenadiers, forgetful of a repulse which they had just sustained, when they saw that he was in danger of capture, returned to the charge, and in the teeth of a tremendous fire, brought him off in safety ; and how Lannes, though severely wounded, threw himself between his General and the enemy, and received three more wounds in protecting his life.<sup>1</sup>

Rivoli closed the campaign in the first month of the new year. His numbers were slightly inferior to those of Alvinzi, though far greater than the Austrian General suspected. But the victory which he achieved is remarkable as having been won by conduct very different from that which distinguished him at Arcola : it was gained by an unworthy trick, which it is somewhat singular that even Lanfrey forbears to mention. Alvinzi's manœuvres had been entirely successful. One strong division had been brought round the rear of the French, so as to cut off their retreat, while a combined force of cavalry, infantry, and artillery was pressing them in front with a vigour which they were unable to withstand. The Austrians were raising a shout of triumph ; the French were dismayed and utterly disheartened, when, to quote the statement of Alison, ' Buonaparte, in order to gain time, sent a flag of truce to Alvinzi, proposing a suspension of arms for half an hour, as he had some propositions to make in consequence of the arrival of a courier with despatches from Paris.' The statement was utterly false ; no such courier had arrived ; but Alvinzi fell into the trap : and Buonaparte gained the time which he required to extricate his men from their unfavourable position. While the victorious Austrians thus reduced to sudden inaction were standing still, every French division was put in motion. And, when the conflict was resumed, the respite so dishonourably obtained, but so skilfully employed, was found to have sufficed to change the whole character of the situation of the two armies, and the day closed in triumph for the French, who, if Alvinzi had been less credulous, could hardly have escaped destruction.

The war was approaching its conclusion. The fall of Mantua, which was the fruit of the victory of Rivoli, encouraged Buonaparte to accomplish his bold promise of traversing the Tyrol, and threatening Vienna itself, and by the end of March he

<sup>1</sup> *Correspondance*, etc. xxix. p. 159.

had reached Clagenfurt, in Carinthia, within 120 miles of the Austrian capital. But he found that he could proceed no further. He had reckoned on the co-operation of the army of the Rhine ; but Moreau, its commander, was unable to move for want of supplies. And it was more than possible that, unless the apparent danger of his metropolis should incline the Emperor to peace, Buonaparte might find that he had advanced to a point where he could neither remain with safety nor retreat with credit. But he could always put a bold face on difficulties. Like our own Drake, in his dealings with the Armada 200 years before, he knew the value 'of a good brag countenance.' And from his camp at Clagenfurt he wrote to the Imperial Commander-in-chief, the Archduke Charles, a letter in which Ségur sees nothing but a noble moderation and generosity ; while, according to Lanfrey, it is but an eloquent expression of

'commonplace topics on the evils of war, with a profession of respect for human life rather hyperbolic in the mouth of a man who has himself recorded the circumstance of his having, in the early part of his career, sent a detachment into action, and caused the death of many men, merely to afford his mistress a sight'—(i. 242.)

The Imperial Government listened gladly to his overtures ; by the end of the first week in April an armistice was agreed to at Leoben ; on the 9th Buonaparte took upon himself to sign the preliminaries of a treaty ; and, though the negotiations were so protracted that it was not till the autumn that peace was definitely concluded at Campo Formio, with the armistice of Leoben the war between France and the Empire was practically terminated.

Ségur more than once interrupts his narrative of warlike operations to dilate with admiration on the exhaustless energy and varied ability with which, while engaged in working out his strategical problems, the General yet found time for a vast and complicated correspondence with politicians in the different Italian States, and for the consideration of the most intricate details of civil business. But the Directory had reason to be less pleased, since, of the arrangements which he concluded, some were made without the slightest authorisation from them, and others in direct violation of their most positive orders. We have seen how he had chosen his own time for marching against Rome ; and in a similar spirit of independence he had concluded a fresh treaty with the King of Sardinia. But these acts were only assumptions of authority which had not been conferred on him. In

all his dealings with the Empire he openly contravened the express orders of the Government at Paris, and took upon himself to make arrangements as if he were an absolute sovereign. A single remark which he makes in his Memoirs on the preliminaries discussed at Leoben leads almost unavoidably to the inference that he had already begun to calculate the day when he should be such. The Austrian Commissioners, among other concessions, offered a recognition of the French Republic. 'Strike out that condition,' said he; 'the Republic is like the sun, which shines by its own power. The blind alone fail to see it.' The words were meant to be reported to the Parisians as a pledge of his loyalty to the principles of the Revolution; but his real feeling was, that 'such a recognition was objectionable, because, if some day the French people should choose to establish a monarchy, the Emperor might object that what he had recognised was the Republic.'<sup>1</sup> He was already, we may suppose, resolved that no step should be taken by any one which might hinder him from eventually becoming the monarch.

It was to no purpose that, the moment that the Directory heard of the armistice of Leoben, they sent General Clarke to conduct the negotiations. He refused to allow Clarke to interfere; and proceeded to establish a new order of things in the North of Italy by his own sole authority. The States on one side of the country he erected into a Cisalpine Republic; out of those on the other he constructed a Ligurian Republic. He picked a quarrel with Venice; compelled the Senate to accept a treaty, which, as he informed the Directory, was a mere illusion, intended to enable him 'to enter the city without difficulty; to get possession of the arsenal and of everything else, and to be able to take from it whatever might suit him, under pretext of secret articles'—(L. i. 268.) And the ink was hardly dry, when he began once more to treat with Austria, proposing to give Venice itself to them in exchange for the Netherlands, which he coveted for France. It was to no purpose that the Directors wrote letters and sent envoys, objecting to some of these measures, and absolutely prohibiting others, especially the cession of Venice to the Empire. He knew how weak they were in themselves and in the estimation in which the Parisians held them. And when, at the beginning of September, a conspiracy was formed to overthrow them, he made a parade to all the world of their weakness, of his own

<sup>1</sup> *Campagne d'Italie—Corr.* xxix. p. 249.

strength, and of their absolute dependence on him, by sending his lieutenant, Augereau, to throw his protection over them; the result, in the view taken of it by Ségur, being greatly to further his own ultimate views, since it was a manifest and decided step towards the resumption of power by the army, in opposition to the people, who had been the sole depositaries of power since 1789—(i. 359.) Nor was he very scrupulous in displaying to the Directors themselves his perception how indispensable he had become to them. Even Ségur points out that it was a favourite trick of his to pretend violent anger; and there are few passages in his Correspondence more characteristic or more amusing than some of the letters which he wrote to them in September and October. He knew that they wished to keep him in Italy. He knew that, above all things, they dreaded his return to Paris, and accordingly, on receiving despatches from them refusing their consent to some of his arrangements, he replied in language expressing the most vehement indignation; reproaching them with 'horrible ingratitude.' 'Woe to those who have no belief in virtue, and who are capable of suspecting mine. My reward is in my own conscience, and in the opinion of posterity.' And he repeatedly insists on their accepting his resignation. He reckoned that the mere threat would frighten them into ratifying the treaty of Campo Formio, in spite of their disapproval of its chief provisions. They did ratify it, and, as the cessation of the war terminated his command in Italy, they endeavoured to prevent his return to Paris, where his victories had created an enthusiastic impression in his favour, by appointing him ambassador to a Congress about to be held at Rastadt, and afterwards commander-in-chief of an army which was preparing for the invasion of England.

But it was not his purpose to allow them to direct his movements further than was consistent with his views of his own interest. He knew how strongly the feelings of the Parisians were excited in his favour, and he did not choose to be kept out of their sight long enough for the impression to fade. Still less was he inclined to efface the lustre of his past campaigns by commanding an expedition in which failure was inevitable.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly he got through the business at Rastadt with great rapidity, and at the beginning of December hastened to Paris, where the Directors

<sup>1</sup> De Bourrienne assures us that he never at any time, neither now nor in 1803, had any real belief in the possibility of invading England successfully.



received him with the most profuse and ostentatious acknowledgment of his services, and the populace with the most real enthusiasm. The street in which he took a house was re-named la Rue des Victoires, and crowds watched around his door for his going out and his coming home, as if the welfare of the State depended on his movements. What those movements were to be, he had not fully decided. He felt the need of a personal inspection of the state of affairs and of parties, but he was not long making up his mind. Some of his officers urged him at once to overthrow the Directory, and to take all the power into his own hands; but he told them that 'the pear was not yet ripe,' and sought to disarm suspicion by a studied privacy of life and modesty of demeanour. He had been elected a member of the Institute, and it was in the dress of that brotherhood that he was usually seen, instead of in his military uniform; its meetings were the only public assemblies which he willingly attended. His object was evidently to remove from the minds of the Republican party, which, as he found, still retained greater strength than he had previously suspected, all apprehension of a military dictator. At the same time he felt that any long inaction in the city would weaken the attachment with which the citizens regarded him, and therefore he resolved on a fresh campaign; but resolved also that he himself would choose its direction; and that direction he had already determined should be Egypt. It was on that country that his eyes had been fixed even while warring in Italy. More than once, in conversations with his most trusted Generals, he had declared that 'great reputations were only to be made in the East,' and that 'the Mediterranean was properly only a French lake.' The Directory entered into his views, not unwillingly, since they would remove him further and longer from the capital than any invasion of England. He had even the address to represent the reduction of Egypt as the most effectual way of injuring Britain, by opening a path to the attack of her Indian possessions, where, according to him, Tippoo Sahib, the Mahrattas, and the Sikhs only awaited a signal 'to fall upon her.'<sup>1</sup> It was easy to find a pretext for the expedition in a treaty which twenty years before the Mamelukes had concluded with the English East India Company, while their Beys had of late so often defied the authority of the Sultan that it was probable that that sovereign would not resent an enterprise which should at

<sup>1</sup> *Camp. d'Egypte et Syrie—Corr.* xxix. 362.



once chastise them for the past, and weaken them for the future. In his secret thoughts Buonaparte unquestionably conceived the possibility that his arms might eventually be employed against the Sultan himself. But such ideas he kept within his own breast, just giving a hint of them in his subsequent account of his operations, where he says: 'The Turkish Government had fallen into a state of decrepitude; and the ultimate results of the expedition might possibly become as extensive as the fortune and genius of the chief who commanded it.'<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, in the summer of 1798 he was placed at the head of an army, in numerical strength and in all its appointments equal to his highest requirements; and he was also invested with an extraordinary authority over the officers of the fleet which was to convey him across the Mediterranean. With what singular good fortune he escaped Nelson, and how completely for a time he succeeded in subduing Egypt, we have no space to relate, nor could the narrative be of any great value. There was but little difficulty, and but little glory to be acquired in defeating armies vastly inferior in number and wholly unused to European manœuvres, and to the deadly vigour of European artillery. But, though in a military point of view it is of less consequence, still the Egyptian expedition has its importance in respect of the General's character, so forcibly does it bring to light some of its worst points—his universal unscrupulousness, as shown in the hypocrisy with which he tried to delude the Moham-medans into believing him friendly to their religion, and even not wholly disinclined to embrace it; his indifference to human life, as exhibited in the poisoning of his own wounded followers at Jaffa, and in the hideous massacre of his Turkish prisoners; and again, his absorbing selfishness, so great as even to deaden him to the claims of military honour, every obligation of which was discarded when he deserted his army at the critical moment when it was surrounded by the difficulties which eventually overwhelmed it; from which, indeed, even he might have failed to extricate it, but in which every principle of honour and duty peremptorily required him to stand by it to the last extremity. Each of these actions is so notorious, and has been so abundantly discussed by writers of every country, and from every point of view, that a bare reference to them is sufficient here.

But, however discreditable his desertion of his command

<sup>1</sup> *Camp. d'Egypte et Syrie—Corr.* xxix. 362.

and abandonment of his army amid difficulties into which he himself had brought it must be admitted to be, it is certain that it was admirably well-timed for his own interest. His absence from France during the past year had been fortunate for himself, by keeping his former triumphs in men's recollection and his name in their mouths even more prominently than if he had been still in Paris. For the war with Austria had been rekindled, and the past year had been one of great disaster to the French armies. Especially had they sustained heavy defeats in the North of Italy; and constant comparisons had been made between their present condition and prospects in that district, and the victories which had been achieved there while he was at hand to lead them; while, as was not unnatural, the Government itself had been more discredited in the eyes of the people than any of the defeated Generals. The Directors were not ignorant of the state of public feeling; they knew that the general mortification and discontent had re-awakened a desire for revolution; and that more than one party was plotting their overthrow. But the danger which they perceived they knew not how to encounter: they were, to accept Ségur's contemptuous description of them, 'four lawyers and one fine gentleman'—(i. 475), and had among them neither statesmanship, nor resolution, nor even unanimity. Some of them were even caballing against their colleagues and ready to endeavour to re-establish the monarchy, if the exiled princes would bribe them with sufficient liberality; while of all the different schemes which were in contemplation there was not one which was kept secret. The consequence was that all Paris, if we may not say all France, was in one general state of agitation and apprehension, when in the middle of October it became known that Bonaparte had landed at Fréjus, and was on his way to the capital.

It seemed as if his arrival had united all parties, or, at least, all parties except that of the Government. At Fréjus the citizens insisted on his landing at once, suspending the quarantine laws, which were exceedingly strict with respect to vessels coming from Egypt, and declaring that 'they would rather have the plague than the Austrians,' whose recent victories had seemed to place the province at their mercy. At Aix, at Lyons, and at the other towns through which he passed, he was received with acclamations—(S. i. 471); and, when he reached Paris, the enthusiasm was such that those of the Directors who regarded him with suspicion or enmity could not venture to show their feelings. But all

were not hostile: the thoughts of all were solely fixed on personal gain; and some of them thought correctly, as it proved, that more was to be made by furthering his designs than by opposing them. We need not dwell in detail on the complicated transactions of the next three weeks. Even before Buonaparte arrived his brothers had been feeling the pulse of the most distinguished military officers, and had secured their support. One of the Directors, the Abbe Sieyès, who at the first moment of his return had been outspoken in his condemnation of him, and had declared that he deserved to be shot for the desertion of his army, found it hopeless to attempt to swim against the tide, and offered himself as his ally, and Buonaparte, who had been equally loud in his denunciations of Sieyès as a corrupt traitor, selling France to Germany (S. i. 485), gladly accepted the proffered alliance. By the end of the first week in November all the arrangements were completed, and the aid of every one whose co-operation was of importance was secured, except that of the inferior assembly, the Council of 500. In that the Republicans and Jacobins were still perhaps the most numerous, and certainly the most violent party. But they had to deal with a man as resolute as themselves. The last days of the Directory can hardly fail to remind the English reader of more than one scene in the great English rebellion. The hypocrisy of Buonaparte did not indeed lead him, as it led Cromwell, to assume the tone of religious fanaticism. On the contrary, the deities in whom he placed his trust he openly proclaimed to be 'the God of Fortune and the God of War'—(S. i. 521.) But he was incessant in his profession and oaths of adherence to the cause of the Republic and of Liberty (*ib.* 506-8), of which he had arranged the overthrow; and Cromwell, in expelling the Parliament with his soldiers in 1653, had set an example which Buonaparte faithfully copied when he led on his grenadiers to drive the Council of 500 from their Hall in 1799.

We need not linger over details. It would be unreasonable to expect a private citizen who aimed at the supreme power to be over nice as to his means, and Buonaparte may fairly be acquitted of any needless violence. In the evening a small remnant of the 500, whom he had expelled in the morning, re-assembled, and passed votes abolishing the Directory, and establishing a new government, composed of three officers, to whom they gave the name of Consuls: two, Sieyès and Ducos, having had seats in the Directory, and the third being Buonaparte himself. Sieyès and Ducos were presently changed for Cambacérès and Lebrun; but the alteration

made no practical difference; for from the first the entire power was engrossed by Buonaparte. And when, before the end of the year, the Constitution was modified, and, instead of a Board of three Consuls of equal rank, he was appointed First Consul, the duties of the second and third Consuls were confined to assisting him with their advice, but they had no authority to control his actions.

Here for a time we must pause. We have seen by what a brilliancy of military genius he concentrated on himself the confidence of the army, and the admiration of the peaceful citizens. And also with what political skill and resolution, displayed at a most critical moment, he availed himself of those feelings to make himself absolute master of both classes. On a future occasion we hope to examine the use which he made of the authority which he had thus acquired.

#### ART. VII.—THE *FILIOQUE* CONTROVERSY AND THE EASTERNS.

1. *On the Clause 'and the Son' in regard to the Eastern Church and the Bonn Conference.* A Letter to the Rev. H. P. LIDDON D.D., by the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. (Parker and Rivingtons, 1876.)
2. *On the History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, from the Apostolic Age to the Death of Charlemagne.* By H. B. SWETE, B.D. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1876.)
3. *Report of the Proceedings of the Reunion Conference at Bonn, 1875.* Translated from the German, with a Preface, by H. P. LIDDON, D.D. (Pickering, 1876.)

HISTORY, we are told, never repeats itself. The aphorism can only be applied with considerable reserve either to secular or ecclesiastical history; least of all, is it applicable to the history of philosophical and religious thought. Theological controversies may become extinct when they have been finally settled by the verdict of the Church, though even so the old questions are not unlikely to reappear in a new form, and with an altered name, not only without, but sometimes within her pale. The mysterious problem of predestination and free will, which in its philosophical aspect had perplexed

the schools of Athens, might seem to have been set at rest by the paramount authority of S. Augustine throughout Western Christendom; yet the dispute was revived centuries afterwards; first, between the Thomists and Scotists, and then, with more than its original bitterness, by Calvin without, and by Jansenius within, the fold of the Latin Church. The course of heresy, which is never a true development, is almost proverbially monotonous, and thus nearly all the mediæval sects reproduced, with variations, the Manichean dualism of an earlier age. It is not wonderful that a writer of Dean Stanley's quite abnormal incapacity, whether natural or acquired, for apprehending the point of theological distinctions, should have spoken of the *Filioque* question not very long ago as 'an excellent specimen of the race of extinct controversies.' But it is certainly a significant and, in one sense, a hopeful illustration of the startling rapidity of the great religious movement of our own day that, within ten years of these words being written, the controversy thus contemptuously dismissed should have again emerged, not as a scholastic speculation, but as a practical question affecting the future reunion of East and West. Dr. Stanley could not, of course, have foreseen in 1861 the Vatican Council and the Old Catholic reaction; but a theologian would have been aware that a controversy bearing directly on the truth of the Divine Nature could never become 'extinct' till it had been decided to the satisfaction of the rival disputants, and no believer in the promises of Christ to His Church has a right to assume that East and West are to remain in perpetual isolation.

There is some difference in the object and method of the two works before us, but they have much in common; and while it is evident that the writers have taken their own line quite independently of each other, there is a remarkable concurrence in the results. Both Dr. Pusey's work and Mr. Swete's may be described as what the Germans call a *Zeitschrift*, for both are occasioned by the proposed articles regarding the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, which emanated from the Bonn Conference of 1875. Mr. Swete's professed aim is simply to collect and arrange materials for the history of the dogma from the Fathers and Councils of the first eight centuries. Dr. Pusey writes with the express aim of showing that the Bonn articles are doctrinally inadequate, to say the very least, and give a wrong version of the history. But both writers set to work in the same way, by a careful examination and citation of authorities, only that Mr. Swete stops at the death of Charlemagne in 814, while Dr. Pusey carries down

the investigation to a later period. We may add that, while Dr. Pusey's citations are usually the fullest, Mr. Swete's book has the advantage for scholars of giving the authorities in the original Greek and Latin. But the passages cited in the two works are, as might be expected, very constantly the same; nor is there much difference, or reasonable ground for difference, in the interpretation put upon them. There are, it will be observed, three questions at issue in the discussion, which require, as far as possible, separate treatment, though the two first partially intersect each other. First, we have to examine what is the true doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit as gathered from the tradition of the Church; and what judgment, therefore, must be pronounced on the controversy between East and West on the subject. Secondly, comes the subordinate inquiry, which is practically of hardly less importance in its bearing on the schism, as to the insertion of the disputed clause in the Nicene Creed. And, thirdly, there is the question which Dr. Pusey has directly raised, and which Mr. Swete's book is equally designed to illustrate, though he refrains from any decisive expression of his own opinion upon it, as to the conformity of the Bonn articles with the results of the inquiry on the two former points.

And here we may just premise that, although Mr. Swete is usually accurate in his theological statements, his book opens with a passage which, if taken alone, would seem to betray a fundamental misapprehension of the point at issue. 'It is,' he tells us, 'to be remembered that the Eastern limitation ["from the Father only"] has reference *only to the essential and eternal derivation* of the Holy Ghost; while the Western addition [*Filioque*] has been authoritatively explained to mean that the Third Person of the Holy Trinity proceeds from the First Person and from the Second as from One Principle and by one spiration.'<sup>1</sup> This is true, of course, as a fact; but the antithesis suggested is a false one. The

<sup>1</sup> The italics are our own. It may be worth while in this connexion to reprint the text of the explanatory canons proposed for the acceptance of both sides by the learned Jesuit Father De Buck, the Bollandist, in his *Essai de Conciliation sur le Dogme de la Procession du Saint Esprit*, quoted at p. 5 of Tondini's *Pope of Rome and Popes of the Oriental Orthodox Church*:—

'Si quis dixerit Patrem solum non esse unicum fontem Trinitatis, anathema sit.

'Si quis dixerit Patrem, gignendo Filium, huic non dedisse ut simul secum produceret Spiritum Sanctum, anathema sit.

'Si quis dixerit Spiritum Sanctum non procedere ex Patre principaliter, seu tamquam ex principio primordiali, et ex Filio non tamquam principio primordiali, sed tamquam habente a Patre ut a se quoque

Western doctrine is, that the Holy Ghost proceeds *essentially and eternally* from the Father and the Son by one spiration, and it is on this point that the controversy hinges; His temporal mission from the Father and the Son has never been denied on either side. The Latin explanation, formally sanctioned at Lyons and Florence, 'from one Principle and by one spiration,' is designed to meet the Greek objection based on the *μοναρχία* of the Eternal Father, not in any way to limit the essential and eternal derivation of the Spirit from the Son also.<sup>1</sup> We cannot doubt that Mr. Swete is aware of this, but his language (on p. 2) is misleading; and the importance of the subject renders a passing word of caution to his readers desirable.

I. It will be convenient, in considering the history of the doctrine, to follow Mr. Swete's arrangement, who takes his authorities in chronological order, noting, as we proceed, Dr. Pusey's use of the same or kindred passages. And here it is important to take note that, in starting from the critical passage on the Procession of the Holy Ghost in S. John's Gospel (xv. 26), Mr. Swete points out that *procedit* was the rendering of *ἐκπορεύεται* in the old Latin version, as known to Novatian, S. Hilary, and S. Ambrose. In the earliest instance of its theological use out of the Canon, Tertullian applies the term to the Generation of the Son, while Marcellus, writing at a later date against the Arians, recognises in the Spirit an essential dependence on the Son, which he cannot distinguish from *ἐκπόρευσις*. The arbitrary distinction, therefore, attempted to be drawn at Bonn between *ἐκπόρευσις* ('issuing out of') and 'procession,' in order to justify the language of the second and fifth articles—to which we shall have to return further on—falls to the ground. The passage of S. John stands alone in the New Testament for

*Spiritus Sanctus existentiam, subsistentiam, et essentiam acciperet, anathema sit.*

'Si quis dixerit Spiritum Sanctum procedere ex Patre et ex Filio de eo in quo alii sunt ab invicem et non de eo in quo unum sunt, anathema sit.

'Si quis ergo dixerit duo esse principia, duasve productiones Spiritus Sancti, et non unum principium unamque productionem, aut Patrem et Filium non esse principium Spiritus Sancti per unam Utrique communem spirationem, anathema sit.

'Si demum quis dixerit Spiritum Sanctum ita procedere ex Patre ut simul non sit Spiritus Filii, aut ita esse Spiritum Filii, ut a Filio non simul ac a Patre existentiam, subsistentiam et essentiam accipiat, et secundum hanc notionem ex Filio non procedat, anathema sit.'—p. 346.

<sup>1</sup> In the Florentine decree of union, 'ex Utrouque æternaliter tamquam ab uno Principio et unica spiratione procedit.'



its theological use of the term *ἐκπορεύομαι*, nor did it find its way before the middle of the fourth century into any creed or rule of faith. It is very seldom applied by ante-Nicene writers to the Procession of the Holy Ghost; and, indeed, they are, for the most part, silent on the subject altogether. We perceive, however, in the Ignatian Epistles, a tendency to represent the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Son as corresponding with that of the Son to the Father, but as yet no accurate discrimination has been made between the cognate ideas of Generation and Procession; and Tertullian, as we have already seen, uses the terms interchangeably.<sup>1</sup> The attention of the Apologists was first directed to the Person of Christ, and thus S. Justin Martyr scarcely touches on the relation of the Spirit to the other Divine Persons. His scholar, Tatian, whose orthodoxy, it need hardly be said, is more than questionable, calls Him 'the minister of the Incarnate Son.' S. Theophilus of Antioch distinguishes Him from the Logos as the Wisdom of God; and Athenagoras declares Him to be 'the Effluence of God (*ἀπόρροια*), flowing from and evermore returning to the Fountain of the Godhead.'

It is a commonplace of theology, that the progress of heresy is a principal factor in the development of Catholic belief, and the history of the Procession dogma forms no exception to the rule. Here, as elsewhere, to adopt Mr. Swete's language, 'heresy introduces us to a fresh stage in the history of Catholic dogma.'<sup>2</sup> The first principles of Gnosticism were incompatible with the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity; and, accordingly, in that system the Holy Spirit becomes an emanation or an *Aeon*. Montanism, which was a reaction from Gnosticism, set itself primarily to deal

<sup>1</sup> 'Temporalis Processio' is used by Aquinas (*Summa*, Pars I. Q. 43, Art. 2) of the Incarnation, 'Æterna Processio' of the Eternal Generation of our Lord. That is to say, generation is a kind of procession, but not *vice versâ*.

<sup>2</sup> 'Wonderful, to see how heresy has but thrown that [Catholic] idea into fresh forms, and drawn out from it further developments, with an exuberance which exceeded all questioning, and a harmony which baffled all criticism; like Him, its Divine Author, who, when put on trial by the Evil One, was but fortified by the assault, and is ever justified in His sayings and overcomes when He is judged'—Newman's *Oxford University Sermons*, p. 317, 3rd edit. Further on, in reference to this very doctrine, the writer says: 'The doctrine of the Double Procession was no Catholic dogma in the first ages, though it was more or less clearly stated by individual Fathers; yet, if it is now to be received, as surely it must be, as part of the Creed, it was really held everywhere from the beginning, and, therefore, in a measure, held as a mere religious impression, and perhaps an unconscious one.'—*Ibid.* p. 323. The unconsciousness, however, cannot be extended, as we shall see presently, beyond the ante-Nicene period.

with the mission of the Paraclete, and thereby brought out more fully the truth concerning His Person. One phase of the Ebionite heresy identified the Spirit with the Son; the *Recognitions* make Him a creation of the Son; and here, curiously enough, the phrase *a Filio* first appears, but in a purely heretical sense, which has no connexion whatever with its subsequent adoption by the Church—'habet quod est ab Unigenito, *factus est enim per factum*, subconnumeratur autem Patre et Filio.' In the same way the formula *per Filium*, which also has Catholic authority, and which found more favour with the Easterns at Bonn, had an Arian origin, and was anathematized in this sense by Pope Damasus: 'Si quis dixerit Spiritum Sanctum *facturam aut per Filium factum*, anathema sit.' What little is known of the *Alogi*, an obscure sect of the last quarter of the second century, goes to show, as Dorner observes, that they were vehemently opposed to the Montanist development of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and thus paved the way for the heterodox Monarchianism of the next century.<sup>1</sup> And Monarchianism, whether in its Ebionite or its Patripassian form, could admit no true Procession of the Spirit from the Father or the Son. One of the earliest statements of Catholic doctrine—not, however, including as yet the Procession from the Son—occurs in a protest of Dositheus, Bishop of Seleucia, against the Sabellian view:—'Pater enim ingenitus, Filius genitus, *Spiritus Sanctus procedens ex Patre* cœqualis per omnia Patri et Filio.' To sum up the results of heretical teaching on this subject during the first three centuries—

'In some systems the Spirit is but a synonym of the Father and the Son, or a particular manifestation of the Divine life. In others He is a Person, but distinct from God: an Æon or an Angel, produced or made by the Supreme. Of this latter class of hypotheses, some represent Him as the *σὺνγενος* and co-equal of the Son: whilst others regard Him as subordinate and the creature of a created Logos. But amidst these contending voices, none was heard to anticipate the judgment of the Church.'

To the Catholic reaction against Gnosticism we owe the great work of S. Irenæus (*Contra Hæreses*) and part of the works of Tertullian. Irenæus at least foreshadows the doctrine of the *Filioque*, when he says, 'Pater enim conditionem simul et Verbum Suum portans, *et Verbum portatum a Patre præstat Spiritum omnibus*, quemadmodum vult Pater;' and again that Christians receive through the Spirit, the Father

<sup>1</sup> Neander's brief reference to the sect (*Church History*, vol. ii. pp. 223, 301) is in harmony with this view.

and the Son, and again that the Spirit is 'communicatio Christi.' We have already seen that Tertullian applies the term *procedere* to the Generation of the Son, as did Novatian afterwards, but he does not use it of the Holy Ghost. He does, however, without employing it, actually state in equivalent terms the doctrine of the Double Procession when he says, in his treatise against Praxeas, 'Tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo *et Filio*, sicut tertius a radice *fructus ex frutice*, et tertius a fonte *rivus ex flumine*, et tertius a sole *apex ex radio*.' Elsewhere he says, without any metaphor, 'Filium non aliunde deduco sed de substantia Patris. . . . *Spiritum non aliunde puto quam à Patre per Filium*;' on which Mr. Swete remarks, with perfect justice, that the doctrine conveyed by the *Filioque* is not appreciably different from what Tertullian expresses by *per Filium*. If we turn from the West to the East, Alexandria, the centre alike of the Neoplatonic revival and of Gnosticism, was the birthplace of Christian theology, as both Döllinger and Newman have reminded us. There is little in the extant works of S. Clement of Alexandria bearing on the Procession of the Holy Ghost, though it is referred to in a passage, variously ascribed to him and to his namesake of Rome, in connexion with His Temporal Mission from the Father. Origin is naturally more diffuse on the subject. He speaks of the Father as 'the Origin and Fount of the Son and the Holy Spirit,' who are yet co-eternal with Himself. And he indicates the Procession from the Son when he says, 'Spiritus Dei et Spiritus Christi unus atque idem mihi Spiritus dici videtur.' Dr. Pusey and Mr. Swete are agreed in thinking that he held substantially the Eternal Procession from the Father through the Son, though he cannot, as Dr. Pusey justly observes, be taken as an accurate exponent of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and rather needs explanation than explains. S. Dionysius of Alexandria, in a passage quoted by both our authors, teaches the same doctrine. So does also S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, who says that 'there is One Holy Spirit, who has His substance (*ὁπαρξιν*) from the Father and is manifested through the Son, being the perfect Image of the perfect Son.' If we sum up the general result of Catholic theology on the subject at the close of the ante-Nicene period, we find that many writers, especially in the West, are almost or altogether silent upon it. But the doctrinal development, prompted in great measure by the questionings of heresy, is already in progress, and from Alexandria and North Africa the answer has been more or less distinctly given, that the Holy Spirit is from the

Father and through the Son. No one has yet distinctly asserted that He proceeds from Both, but still less has it been even faintly hinted that He is from the Father alone. And so we are brought to the great Arian controversy of the fourth century, the age of heresies, of Councils, and of Creeds.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Swete examines in separate chapters the Eastern and Western theology of what may be called the Arian period, extending from the Nicene Council in 325 to 431, the date of S. Augustine's death and of the Council of Ephesus, when a new series of heresies, bearing on the doctrine of the Incarnation, was opened with the Nestorian controversy.<sup>2</sup> And here Dr. Pusey's work, which is less full in its treatment of the earlier period, comes in to supplement him. In this period are included the two first Œcumenical Councils and the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds, the latter of which, in its original form, defines the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. This Creed, however, as Dr. Pusey has clearly shown, was not generally received till after it had been endorsed by the sanction of the Fourth Œcumenical Council, held at Chalcedon in 451, and in 430 S. Cyril had not even heard of it. It was the Nicene Creed, without the later additions, and containing, therefore, no reference to the Procession of the Holy Ghost, which was recited at the Council of Ephesus, and to it alone applies the famous Ephesine Canon against imposing any other creed on heretics returning to the Church, which is often so absurdly quoted against the *Filioque*; but to that point we shall have to return presently. Arianism, of course, made short work of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. 'For an eternal procession from the Father it from the first practically [not to say doctrinally] substituted *creation by the Son*.' And Eusebius, in controverting the views of Marcellus, who was accused of Sabellian tendencies, uses language which not only 'anticipates the modern [Greek] view of the procession, as being simple mission,' but can only be acquitted of Arianism by explaining it away. S. Cyril of Jerusalem, though he dwells on the office and work of the Spirit, declines to go beyond the actual words of Scripture in speaking of his Divine Nature and Person. It was hardly possible for the great protagonist of orthodoxy to be equally reticent. Athanasius does not lay down in so

<sup>1</sup> Hahn has collected (*Bibliothek der Symbole*) twelve forms of 'acatholic' creeds of the fourth century, nearly all of which assert the mission of the Paraclete from the Son, but ignore His eternal Procession.

<sup>2</sup> See Translator's Preface to vol. ii. of Hefele's *History of Councils*.

many words the doctrine of the Double Procession, but he states it 'substantially,' to quote Mr. Swete, when he affirms the relation of the Spirit to the Son to be the same as that of the Son to the Father; that He is according to His Essence the very own Spirit of the Son, as the Son is of the Essence of the Father; that the Son being with the Father is the Fountain of the Holy Spirit; and still more explicitly (in a passage which appears to have escaped Dr. Pusey's notice), that 'He is said to proceed from the Father, since He shines forth from (ἐκλάμπει παρὰ) the Word, who is confessed to be from the Father, and is sent and given by Him.' Didymus, the teacher of S. Jerome and Rufinus, goes further in the treatise on the Holy Spirit, translated by the former, and expressly asserts the full Western doctrine over and over again, if we may trust the MSS. which Dr. Pusey quotes without any misgiving. Mr. Swete points out that there are variations of reading in the two first extracts given below, but not in the third, which, if genuine, would alone be sufficiently decisive of the writer's belief.<sup>1</sup> But if there is some doubt in the case of Didymus as to the genuineness of the text, there is none in the case of S. Epiphanius, whose language is, if possible, still more explicit. Petavius is fully justified in saying that the passages are so clear 'ut nemo clarius ac dilucidius etiam Latinorum Patrum locutus sit.' It is true, indeed, as Mr. Swete observes, that in two creeds which he has inserted in his *Ancoratus*, he does not state the Double Procession, but he had, of course, no right, as an individual theologian, to formulate new articles of faith. Of his own opinion there can be no doubt, but our readers shall judge for themselves. Considering the importance and clearness of his testimony, it will be well to put on record here the passages cited by Dr. Pusey, from which Mr. Swete has extracted the critical phrases in the original:—

'S. Epiphanius nowhere uses the word "through," but always [ἐκ] "from," when speaking of the Eternal being of the Holy Spirit. And these are no chance passages of S. Epiphanius, but passages

<sup>1</sup> § 34. Salvator, qui et Veritas, ait, non enim loquetur a semetipso; "hoc est, non sine me et sine meo et Patris arbitrio, quia inseparabilis a mea et Patris est voluntate: qui non ex se est sed ex Patre et me. Hoc enim ipsum quod subsistit et loquitur a Patre et me illi est. Ego veritatem loquor: id est, inspiro quæ loquitur, siquidem Spiritus veritatis est." § 36. "Non potest Filio loquente audire quæ nescit, cum hoc ipsum sit quod profertur a Filio, id est, procedens a Veritate, consolator manans de consolatore, Deus de Deo, Spiritus veritatis procedens." § 37. "Neque enim quid aliud est Filius exceptis his quæ ei dantur a Patre; neque alia substantia est Spiritus Sancti præter id quod datur ei a Filio" (Swete, p. 94.)

in which he is carefully stating and guarding the truth as to the existence of the Holy Trinity. The first is against the heresy of Sabellius.

"For the Spirit ever is, with the Father and the Son, not in relation of brother with the Father, not begotten, not created, not brother of the Son, not grandson of the Father, but ever proceeding from the Father and receiving of the Son : not alien from Father and Son, but *from* (ἐκ) the same Essence, *from* (ἐκ) the same Godhead, *from* (ἐκ) the Father and the Son, with the Father and the Son, ever subsisting Holy Spirit, Divine Spirit, Spirit of glory, Spirit of Christ, Spirit of the Father. For it is *the Spirit of the Father, Who speaketh in you*, and *My Spirit standeth in the midst of you*, the Third in appellation, equal in Godhead, not alien from the Father and the Son, the Bond of the Trinity, the seal of the confession."

'And in his elaborate exposition of the faith, which he partly embodies in his writing against "the blasphemers of the Holy Ghost :"

"The Holy Spirit ever is, not begotten, &c., but *from* (ἐκ) the same Essence of the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit. For God is Spirit." "He is the Spirit of the Son ; not by any composition (as in us, soul and body), but in the midst of the Father and the Son, *from* (ἐκ) the Father and the Son, the third in appellation." "Whole God is Wisdom ; so then the Son is Wisdom from Wisdom, in Whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom. Whole God is Life ; therefore the Son is Life from Life. For 'I am the way, the truth, and the life.' But the Holy Spirit *from Both* (παρ' ἀμφοτέρων) is Spirit from Spirit ; for God is Spirit."

"But some one will say : Do we then say that there are two Sons ? How then is He Only-begotten ? But who art thou, who speakest against God ? For since He calls Him Who is from Him, the Son, and That which *is from Both* (τὸ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων) the Holy Spirit ; which being conceived by the saints through faith alone, being lightful, lightgiving, have a lightful operation, and by the light of faith are in harmony with the Father Himself ; hear thou, that the Father is Father of Him, Who is the True Son and wholly Light, and the Son is of True Father, Light of Light (not, as things created or made, in title only), and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Truth, the third Light *from* (παρὰ) Father and Son." "As there are many sons by adoption or calling, not in truth, because they have beginning and end, and are inclined to sin, so there are very many spirits by adoption or calling, although inclined to sin. But the Holy Spirit is Alone entitled *from* (ἀπὸ) the Father and the Son, the Spirit of Truth, and Spirit of God, and Spirit of Christ and Spirit of grace." "If then He proceedeth *from* (παρὰ) the Father ; and, the Lord saith, He shall take of Mine, then in the same way, in which no one knows the Father save the Son, nor the Son, save the Father, so, I dare to say, that no one knoweth the Spirit, save the Father and the Son, *from* (παρ') Whom He proceedeth and from Whom He taketh, and neither doth any one know the Son and the Father, save the Holy Spirit, Who truly glorifieth, Who teacheth all things, Who tes-

tifieth concerning the Son, Who is *from* (παρὰ) the Father and *of* (ἐκ) the Son." "The Father then ever was, and the Spirit breatheth *from* (ἐκ) the Father and the Son, and neither is the Son created, nor is the Spirit created. But all things, after Father and Son and Holy Ghost, being created and made, once not being, came into being from Father Son and Holy Ghost through the Eternal Word, with the Eternal Father."

"Since Christ from (ἐκ) the Father is believed to be God from (ἐκ) God, and the Spirit is from (ἐκ) Christ or from (παρ') Both, as Christ saith, 'Who proceedeth (παρὰ) from the Father and He shall take of Mine.'"<sup>1</sup>

S. Basil and the two Gregories, of Nyssa and Nazianzus, do not speak with the same decision. S. Basil, however, in a passage quoted by Dr. Pusey, where he is dwelling on the co-eternal order of the Three Divine Persons, says that, 'as the Son is to the Father, so the Spirit is to the Son, according to the order of the word delivered in Baptism.' And he often speaks of the procession of the Spirit *through* the Son (ἐκ Θεοῦ δι' Υἱοῦ). Mr. Swete says that 'he never passes from δι' Υἱοῦ to ἐξ Υἱοῦ or παρ' ἀμφοτέρων.' But he does use παρὰ of the relation of the Spirit to the Son, in a passage which was brought forward in the Council of Florence, but was disputed by the Greeks, and is disallowed by the Benedictine editors. Dr. Pusey cites authorities to prove that it was in a MS. 600 years older than the Council, and anterior to the beginning of the controversy on the Procession. We may add that S. Basil's refraining, if he did refrain, from using the formula 'from the Son,' so little indicates his disbelief of the doctrine, that throughout his treatise on the Holy Spirit, expressly composed against heretics who denied His Divinity, he studiously abstains from giving Him the name of God. S. Gregory of Nyssa virtually asserts the Western doctrine, not only in saying, in a passage quoted by Bessarion, that the Spirit 'is manifested through the Son,' but more directly in making the Son the μεσίτης in the Holy Trinity, through whom the essential life of the Father flows eternally to the Holy Ghost. We append the passage in a note.<sup>2</sup> In a fragment of his third Oration on the Lord's Prayer the formula ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ occurs, and is shown by Cardinal Mai to have good MS. authority; Petavius disputes the ἐκ on grounds of internal evidence. S. Gregory of

<sup>1</sup> Pusey's *Letter to Rev. H. P. Liddon*, pp. 119-121.

<sup>2</sup> Τὸ μὲν γὰρ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου, τὸ δὲ διὰ τοῦ προσεχῶς ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου. ὥστε καὶ τὸ μονογενὲς ἀναμφίβολον ἐπὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ μένειν, καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς εἶναι τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ ἀμφιβάλλειν τῆς τοῦ Υἱοῦ μεσιτείας καὶ αὐτῷ τὸ μονογενὲς φυλαττούσης, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς φυσικῆς πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα σχέσεως μὴ ἀπειργούσης.—(Swete, p. 103.)



Nazianzus is content to establish the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and declines to follow the heretics of his day into an analysis of the mystery of His Being.

We have thus traced the course of Eastern theology through the Arian period to the date of the Council of Ephesus. And the outcome of its testimony in favour of the Double Procession is certainly rather understated than overstated by Mr. Swete, who, be it remembered, does not profess to be arguing for that doctrine, but simply examining authorities, when he says—the italics are our own—that the ‘Procession of the Holy Ghost *through* the Son was undoubtedly maintained by a majority of the great Church teachers who flourished in the East during the fourth century; by one of them, *perhaps* by two, the Father and the Son was regarded as the joint Source from which the Spirit issues forth.’ It must be borne in mind that ‘through’ has been shown to be really equivalent to ‘from,’ unless otherwise explained; and no hint of a disclaimer of the *Filioque* has yet been heard from any orthodox writer. It would be more accurate to say that the great majority of the Eastern Fathers of this period regarded the Father and the Son as the joint Source of the Holy Spirit, though only two of them certainly, Didymus and S. Epiphanius—for it is hardly conceivable that *all* the passages cited from Didymus should be spurious—and perhaps four, have expressly said so.

Mr. Swete is probably right in thinking that the Nicene Council gave a powerful impetus to theological activity in the West. Certainly the fourth and fifth centuries are much richer than those which preceded in great theological names, not to add that S. Augustine is a host in himself. It is true that what has been called the anthropological side of theology took more permanent hold of the practical Western mind than those speculations on the Divine Nature which had so special an attraction for the philosophical mind of the East. But the Arian and Nestorian controversies compelled attention to this class of questions also, and S. Leo is the great doctor of the Incarnation as S. Athanasius is of the Trinity. It was, in fact, in the West that the full and perfect harmony of the various explanations of the revealed doctrine of the Person and Nature of the Holy Ghost, which had been struck out in the progress of theological discussion, was first distinctly recognised and proclaimed. S. Hilary all but anticipates the final solution. He tells us that the Holy Spirit ‘*Patre et Filio Auctoribus confitendus est*,’ and that He comes through Him, ‘*per Quem omnia et ex Quo omnia* ;’ that is, through the

Son. And he asks, without directly answering the question, whether 'a Filio accipere' is the same as 'a Patre procedere,' 'evidently inclining,' says Mr. Swete, 'to the affirmative,'—we should rather say implying it.<sup>1</sup> In the *Opus Historicum*, he says more directly, 'Cum sit Pater in Filio et Filius in Patre, et Spiritus Sanctus accipiet ex Utroque.' Passing over the African rhetorician, Marius Victorinus, whose somewhat ambiguous language is in substantial accord with Hilary's, and S. Phæbadius of Agen, who explicitly asserts the Procession from the Son in his treatise *De Fide Orthodoxâ*, we come to the great S. Ambrose, whose work *De Spiritu Sancto* is the first Latin treatise on the Holy Ghost. It is largely based on Eastern authorities, but, as Dr. Pusey and Mr. Swete are agreed, it distinctly implies, if it does not actually assert, the Procession of the Spirit from the Son as involved in His Temporal Mission: 'Non ergo quasi ex loco mittitur Spiritus aut quasi ex loco procedit quando procedit ex Filio . . . cum procedit a Patre et Filio, non separatur a Patre, non separatur a Filio.' He calls the Son the Fountain of Life, because He is the Fountain of the Spirit who is Life. He not only speaks of 'goodness and sanctification and the imperial right of eternal power being derived from one Father through one Son to one Holy Spirit,' but treats the Spirit's receiving from the Son as at least analogous to His procession from the Father. The Spirit receives from the Son His Divine Attributes and His very Essence; and all these statements are repeated in various forms. It matters therefore little that the words 'procedere ex Filio' do not occur with direct reference to the Eternal procession of the Spirit in S. Ambrose's genuine works. But, moreover, his contribution to the development of this great doctrine is not to be measured by his writings only. To Ambrose, under God, the Church owes the master mind to whom it was reserved to complete the fabric of which, curiously enough, his fellow-countryman Tertullian had laid the foundations nearly two centuries before. The last word on this great mystery was to be spoken by S. Augustine.

In the chapter on the Holy Spirit in his early work *De Fide et Symbolo*, S. Augustine acknowledges the difficulty of handling a subject which had never as yet received any complete treatment in the theology of the Church. But he lays down certain points already ascertained, as that He is consubstantial with the Father and the Son, but personally distinct,

<sup>1</sup> 'Ascendit in cœlos. . . misit nobis Spiritum Sanctum de propria Sua et ipsâ una Substantiâ. . . "De meo," inquit, "accipiet," ex eo utique quod est Filius; quia et Filius de eo quod Pater est.'

that He is not derived from Either by Generation, and yet is not *ἀναγχο*s, and he further intimates that He is the Divine Bond of Charity between them, who is at the same time Himself a Person. In his later work, *De Trinitate*, S. Augustine enters more deeply into the question, carefully distinguishing between Mission and Procession, and enunciating for the first time the two great principles that Mission depends on Procession, and that the Procession from Father and Son is by one Spiration and as from one Source :

"Nec possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus et a Filio non procedat . . . Flatus ille corporeus [S. John xx. 22] . . . fuit . . . demonstratio per congruam significationem non tantum a Patre sed et Filio procedere Spiritum Sanctum." "Fatendum est Patrem et Filium principium esse Spiritus Sancti : non duo principia ; sed sicut Pater et Filius unus Deus . . . sic relative ad Spiritum Sanctum unum principium." In these few words we at length have the statement to which Western, and to a considerable extent Eastern thought had been tending for two centuries. Tertullian's *a Patre per Filium*, Hilary's *Patre et Filio auctoribus*, the *παρ' ἀμφοτέρων* of S. Epiphanius, the *διὰ τοῦ μέσου* of S. Gregory of Nyssa, find at last their logical outcome and expression in the *Pater et Filius unum principium* of the greater Bishop of Hippo.<sup>1</sup>

The doctrine is more fully worked out in the *Tractatus in S. Joannem*. We again quote Mr. Swete :

'In Tract xcix. (on S. John xvi. 13) the question of the Spirit's procession from the Son is formally raised : "hic aliquis forsitan quærat utrum et a Filio procedat Spiritus Sanctus. Filius enim solius Patris est Filius, et Pater solius Filii est Pater ; Spiritus autem Sanctus non est minus eorum Spiritus, sed amborum . . . Cur ergo non credamus quod etiam de Filio procedat Spiritus Sanctus, cum Filiu quoque ipse sit Spiritus ? . . . Quid aliud significavit illa insufflatio [S. John xx. 22], nisi quod procedat Spiritus Sanctus de ipso ?" Then, boldly facing the obvious objection that "the Son Himself speaks only of a procession from the Father," the preacher replies, "Cur putas, nisi quemadmodum ad eum [*sc.* Patrem] solet referre et quod ipsius est, de quo et ipse est ?" *E.g.* in S. John vii. 16 our Lord says, "My doctrine is not mine." It was not his, it was the Father's, inasmuch as He Himself is of the Father. Yet it was His nevertheless, since He and the Father are One. "Quanto magis illic intelligendum est et de ipso procedere Spiritus Sanctus, ubi sic ait 'de Patre procedit' et non diceret, 'de me non procedit.'" From Augustine's point of view, the *παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς* is not exclusive : it asserts the *μοναρχία*, but does not lose sight of the *ὁμοούσιον* ; does not shut out the Consubstantial Son from being with the Father, though subordinately to Him, the One Principle of the Holy Ghost. "A quo autem habet Filius ut sit Deus (est enim de Deo Deus), ab

<sup>1</sup> Swete's *Doctrine of Procession*, &c. pp. 125-126.

illo habet utique ut etiam de illo procedat Spiritus Sanctus ; ac per hoc Spiritus Sanctus ut etiam de Filio procedat sicut procedat de Patre, ab ipso habet Patre." The procession from the Son must not, however, be regarded as posterior in time to the procession from the Father, or as distinct from it in fact : " Spiritus Sanctus non de Patre procedit in Filium et de Filio procedit ad sanctificandam creaturam, sed simul de utroque procedit." <sup>1</sup>

In the fifteenth chapter of the *De Trinitate* the relations of the Divine Persons are illustrated by the memory, understanding, and will of man, but an important caution is added against pressing this analogy, as though there could be any priority or posteriority of time in the eternal life of God :

' Quapropter qui potest intelligere sine tempore generationem Filii de Patre, intelligat sine tempore processionem Spiritûs Sancti de utroque . . . intelligat sicut habet Pater in semetipso ut de illo procedat idem Spiritus Sanctus, sic dedisse Filio ut de illo procedat idem Spiritus Sanctus, et uterque sine tempore . . . Si enim quidquid habet de Patre habet Filius, de Patre habet utique ut et de illo procedat Spiritus Sanctus . . . Filius autem de Patre natus est, et Spiritus Sanctus de Patre principaliter et ipso sine ullo temporis intervallo dante communiter de utroque procedit.' <sup>2</sup>

And finally in his treatise *Contra Maximum*, written shortly before his death, the great doctor thus distinguishes between Generation and Procession : ' Non omne quod procedit nascitur, quamvis omne procedat quod nascitur.' And He is said by Christ to proceed from the Father, ' quoniam Pater processionis Ejus est Auctor, qui talem Filium genuit, et gignendo Ei dedit ut etiam de Ipso procederet Spiritus Sanctus.' It would be easy to multiply quotations ; but these will suffice to prove how completely the true doctrine of the Double Procession is brought out by S. Augustine under all its aspects ; and it is impossible, as Mr. Swete reminds us, to set aside these decisive passages as either interpolated or ambiguous.<sup>3</sup> Nor is he conscious of any divergence of opinion on the subject within the Church : the doctrine of the *Filioque* forms part of his reply to Arian and Macedonian assailants of her faith from without. Dr. Pusey, who brings forward the same passages, clenches his argument by a weighty consideration as to the authority of S. Augustine, and of two great Latin writers who preceded him in the enunciation of the same verity :

<sup>1</sup> Swete's *Doctrine of Procession*, &c., pp. 126-127.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 129.

<sup>3</sup> It is to be regretted that a writer of the calibre of the late Dr. Neale should have allowed himself to suggest interpolation, manifestly on grounds quite independent of the evidence.

'These Latin fathers, S. Hilary, S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine, have been quoted as authorities on other matters of doctrine at General Councils, and so have been formally acknowledged as authorities in the Church by the Greeks also. At the Council of Ephesus, S. Cyril quoted S. Ambrose as well as S. Cyprian: at the end of the tome of S. Leo, read at the Council of Chalcedon, are quoted S. Hilary, Bishop and Confessor, S. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, with S. Gregory of Nazianzus, and S. Chrysostom and S. Cyril; in the 5th General Council, S. Augustine was quoted; in the 6th, S. Augustine and S. Ambrose are quoted, as holy and select fathers, together with S. Athanasius and S. Chrysostom: and in a later session S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, and S. Leo.'<sup>1</sup>

The general reception of this distinctive teaching is further illustrated by the incidental testimony of two Latin poets of the same period, S. Paulinus of Nola and the well-known Prudentius. The former says:

'Spiritum ab Unigenâ Sanctum et Patre procedentem.'

Prudentius, to take one example only, concludes his fifth hymn:

'Qui noster Dominus, qui Tuus unicus  
Spirat de Patris corde Paraclitum.'

Henceforth the doctrine of the Double Procession passes in the West out of the region of discussion, and becomes a recognised and integral portion of the faith of the Church, though it has not yet found formal expression in the Creed. We cannot pause to follow our authors in detail through the long string of extracts in evidence of this fact which they have collected from Latin fathers and theologians, who repeat in the most explicit and almost identical terms their dogmatic belief in the procession of the Holy Spirit *a* or *de* or *ex Patre et Filio*, *de* or *ex Utroque*, or *de Ipsorum Substantiâ*. But it is worth noting that S. Leo says *de Utroque processit*, inasmuch as the Greeks to this day annually anathematize on 'Orthodox Sunday' (our Trinity Sunday) all who reject his teaching! Among these Latin writers, of different countries, are S. Eucherius of Lyons, Gennadius of Marseilles, Julianus Pomerius of Arles, Agnellus, Archbishop of Ravenna, S. Gregory, Archbishop of Tours, Cæsarius, Archbishop of Arles, Faustus of Riez, Archbishop Avitus of Vienne, Ferrandus of Carthage, Paschasius, Boëtius, Cassiodorus, S. Fulgentius, Pope Hormisdas (who is addressing the Eastern Emperor Justin), S. Leo, and S. Gregory the Great, who sums up the *rationale* of

<sup>1</sup> Pusey, p. 148.

the doctrine in saying that Mission is to be understood '*juxta naturam Divinitatis. Missio ipsa processio est quæ de Patre procedit et Filio.*' On the character of these testimonies Dr. Pusey makes a comment which is the more important as it turns also on another controversy of historical and theological interest, as to the date of the Athanasian Creed:

'Any one, who has looked over the statements on this doctrine, collected by Petavius and others from Latin writers of the Vth and VIth centuries must, I think, have been struck by the naked simplicity of their statements, as contrasted with the reasoning of S. Hilary, S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine. At first sight, they disappointed me, as looking meagre. Observing, however, that two of the earlier, S. Paulinus and Prudentius, were connected with Spain, I cannot but think that the conciseness of the rest arises from their being repetitions of a common formula, that of the Athanasian Creed. They are a remarkable contrast with the rich and varied language of Greek fathers. Their identity with the Athanasian Creed lies on the surface.'<sup>1</sup>

'All this naked identity of language implies, I think, an identity of a formula whose language it is, and that formula, I doubt not, was the Athanasian Creed. If successive writers, in speaking of the Divinity of God the Son, were to repeat, one after the other, "we believe that He is 'Very God of Very God'" and were to confine themselves to this one saying, no one, I think, would doubt, that they were using the one formula of the Nicene Creed. As little room, I think, there is for doubting that these writers, using the one formula, "proceeding from the Father and the Son," were using the Athanasian.'<sup>2</sup>

To which it may be added that a canon at the beginning of the sixth century imposed a penalty on any cleric who neglected to learn the Athanasian Creed by heart. The precise date of the Creed is not indeed a question of any great doctrinal importance. Its authority is not derived, like that of the forged decretals (to which it has been most absurdly compared), from the supposed date of its authorship, or from the name which it probably came to bear, not as being considered the composition of Athanasius, but as being demonstrably known to enshrine his faith. If, therefore, its history was really 'gangrened with imposture,' as Dean Stanley has audaciously asserted, that would not affect its dogmatic weight. But the value of his criticism may be estimated by the remark that 'Quesnel conjectured that it was the work of the African Bishop Vigilius of Thapsus, chiefly from the unfortunate reputation which he acquired for passing off his own works under fictitious names.' Mr. Brewer has shown that Quesnel says nothing of the kind, and that Vigilius never attempted to pass

<sup>1</sup> Pusey, p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 60.

off any of his works under a fictitious name. It is, in fact, proved by an accumulation of evidence, external and internal, which is simply conclusive, that the Creed cannot have been composed after the fifth, and is probably a work of the fourth, century; the absence of all definite reference to the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies—still more to the later heresy of Adoptionism—would alone settle that point, as Waterland argued long ago; and the wholly unsuspicious testimony of Sir Duffus Hardy as to the age of the MS. of the Utrecht Psalter confirms this conclusion. In external authority, indeed, the *Quicumque vult* stands second only to the Nicene Creed, and far higher than the so-called Apostles' Creed, which to this day is unknown in the East, and upon which every charge which has been brought against the former, of doubtful authorship, variations of text, late or partial reception, and spurious nomenclature, might be retorted with more than equal force. It is truly marvellous that Mr. Swete should still think it an open question, in the face of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, whether this Creed may not have been composed, according to Mr. Ffoulkes's exploded paradox, in the time of Charlemagne; and it is hardly less surprising that he should also attach any value to what Mr. Brewer designates 'the grossly heretical nonsense' of Professor Swainson's arguments on the subject. Our readers will pardon this brief digression, if such it can be called, in view of the probable influence of the *Quicumque vult*, as will appear further by and by, on the development of the Western doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

And now, before coming to the first insertion of the *Filioque* into the Creed, let us take up the thread of doctrinal history in the East, which we have already traced to the beginning of the fifth century. We have seen that during the Arian period procession 'through the Son' was already the general teaching of the Eastern Fathers, while procession 'from the Son' was explicitly affirmed by some of the greatest of them. No one asserted it more distinctly than Apollinaris, who, in his zeal against Arianism, unhappily fell into the opposite error of denying the Human Soul of Christ. It was, perhaps, partly on this account that Theodore of Mopsuestia, who undertook to answer him, is altogether silent as to the procession of the Spirit through or from the Son, while the *Ecthesis*, which bears his name, expressly denies it. But Theodore's teaching is more profoundly heretical than that which he opposed, and his 'impious' writings were accordingly anathematized by the Fifth Œcumenical Council.



Nestorianism had a more important bearing on the course of orthodox theology. The peculiar and perverse manner in which Nestorius represented the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Sacred Humanity, in which he was partially supported by Theodoret, led his great antagonist, S. Cyril, to draw out with elaborate fulness and precision the true doctrine on the entire subject. He is, as Dr. Pusey says, 'a library in himself.'

'(1) He saw that if the Son is True God, the Spirit of God must be His very own: οὐκ ὀθνεῖον . . . ἀλλὰ τὸ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἴδιον Πνεῦμα. (2) Next, this relation of the Spirit to Christ involves an immanence in the Son, and a dependence upon the Person of the Son, with 'which the procession from the Father does not interfere. Thus, in the commentary on S. Luke xi. 20, we read, ὥσπερ ὁ δακτυλὸς ἀπὸ ἡρώτηται τῆς χειρὸς, οὐκ ἀλλότριός ὢν αὐτῆς ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῇ φυσικῶς· οὕτω καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον τῷ τῆς ὁμοουσιότητος λόγῳ συνήπται πρὸς ἑνωσιν τῷ Υἱῷ, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται. (3) Further, from the essential relation of the Son to the Father and of the Spirit to Both, it follows that the Spirit in proceeding from the Father, goes forth (a) through, (b) from, and (c) out of the Son.'<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Swete proceeds to illustrate these points in detail from the writings of Cyril, showing clearly that he uses 'from' and 'through the Son' interchangeably to denote the essential derivation of the Spirit from the Son, as being One in Essence with the Father.<sup>2</sup> And, though he does not use the word ἐκπόρευσις, he makes it perfectly clear, as Dr. Pusey points out, that the Temporal Mission of the Spirit from the Father and the Son is one and the same, because it depends on the Eternal Procession, and He is eternally by nature the Spirit of Both. And thus, in Mr. Swete's words, 'following the tradition of his own Church, and the guidance of the earlier Greek theologians, S. Cyril reached substantially the same result' as S. Augustine had reached in the West, 'and his teaching received at least the tacit assent of contemporary Eastern Catholics.' It received, in fact, something more, for his third letter to Nestorius, with an explanation containing the doctrine of the Double Procession, was publicly read out at the Council of Ephesus. Meanwhile Theodoret's reply to S. Cyril, which supplies the solitary and somewhat doubtful example in any Greek father of an explicit denial of procession through or from the Son, was

<sup>1</sup> Swete, p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> Thus, e.g. in the *De Adorat.*: εἴπερ ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τὸ οὐσιώδως ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἡγῶν ἐκ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ προχέμενον Πνεῦμα.

condemned by the Fifth Œcumenical Council.<sup>1</sup> And Theodoret had been a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

This agreement of East and West in the doctrine is further illustrated in the theology of the Syrian Church, as represented by such writers as Severian, Bishop of Gabala, Aphraates, and S. Ephraim of Edessa, in the fourth century; S. James of Sarug, S. Isaac of Seleucia, and S. Maruthas of Tagrit, in the fifth. S. Isaac and S. Maruthas presided in 410 at the Council of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, the second canon of which is entitled 'the Creed laid down by the Bishops of Persia,' and contains the following clause: 'We confess the living Holy Spirit, the living Paraclete, who is from the Father and the Son, in One Trinity, in One Essence, in One Will, in accordance with the creed of the 318 Bishops in the city of Nice.'<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pusey adds, justly enough, that the Double Procession must have been held by the orthodox Syrians, since both Nestorians and Eutychians took it with them from the Church, though they gradually lost it afterwards, and while heretics lose the faith they take with them in their separation they never gain any which they had not before. This is the first recorded introduction of the *Filioque* into a formal Creed based on the Nicene, but not identical with it, but it did not challenge general attention and it provoked no controversy. Very different was the ultimate result of a similar procedure in the West, to which we must now return.

II. Hitherto, as we have seen, there was no dispute about the doctrine of the Procession between East and West, and the same truth was confessed by both alike. The innocent origin of a breach which has not yet been healed must be sought in the ecclesiastical history of Spain. It is not wonderful that the Spanish Church, between Arianism on the one hand and the Priscillianists on the other, should have been early forced, as Mr. Swete puts it, into a controversial and dogmatic attitude unique in the West. It would indeed be a curious subject of inquiry—which cannot, however, be pursued here—how far the fierce orthodoxy which at a later date produced the Inquisition may be traced to a similar

<sup>1</sup> Neander (iv. 90) thinks it clear that Theodoret only intended, in the passage quoted by Mr. Swete, to deny the heretical notion of the *creation* of the Spirit by the Son; and the words are certainly open to that interpretation, which is rather favoured than otherwise by the extreme vehemence of his language. Cf. also Le Quien, *Diss. Damasc.* p. ii. sq.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pusey refutes conclusively and at length the objections which have been raised by Hefele and others to the historical reality of this Synod and its acts. Mr. Swete, who refers briefly to the Council and quotes the Creed, does not apparently think them worth noticing.

cause. About the middle of the fourth century was held, by the advice of S. Leo, the second Council of Toledo, to condemn the Priscillianist heresy, and there probably was promulgated the confession of faith which is appended to the acts of the first Council held in 400. It contains the clause: 'Est ergo ingenitus Pater, genitus Filius, non genitus Paracletus, sed a Patre Filioque procedens.' But the circumstance attracted no special notice at the time. It was more than a century later that the famous third Council of Toledo met in 589, when the Visigoths of Spain, with King Recared at their head, renounced Arianism in a body, and submitted to the Catholic Church. At this Synod an anathema was passed on all who did not believe the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son; and the Constantinopolitan Creed was recited with the clause 'Et in Spiritum Sanctum Dominum et Vivificantem, ex Patre et Filio procedentem.' It was expressly declared in the second canon to be 'secundum usum Ecclesiarum Orientalium Concilii Constantinopolitani.' That there was no idea of making any innovation is abundantly evident. The addition may have crept in unconsciously, as Mr. Swete suggests, during the period of the Arian persecutions, originating as a gloss on the *ex Patre*, known to be in harmony with Catholic belief; or it may have been adopted, as Dr. Pusey supposes, from the earlier Council against the Priscillianists, or from the Athanasian Creed. At all events, it is morally certain that, whoever inserted the clause, must have thought it had dropped accidentally out of the Latin copies of the Nicene Creed, and that the Bishops of the Third Council of Toledo had no suspicion of its not being an integral part of that Creed. Nor was the mistake discovered till two centuries afterwards. The insertion derived a practical and permanent effect from the fact that the liturgical use of the Creed at Mass was also enjoined by this same Council, for the express purpose of imprinting the orthodox faith on the popular mind; and hence the multiplication of copies, and general familiarity with its language, made subsequent variation impossible.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the *Filioque* was introduced into certain collects of the Mozarabic Breviary, and the Creed with the inserted

<sup>1</sup> The public recitation of the Creed in the Liturgy had been introduced about a century earlier, of course without the disputed clause, in the East. Mr. Swete mentions a custom peculiar to the Mozarabic rite, of reciting the Creed between the consecration and the communion of the clergy and people, while the priest held the Body of the Lord in his hands; and this may have tended to impress a reverence for the *ipsisima verba* still more strongly on their minds.

clause was solemnly reasserted at eleven Councils of Toledo, from the fifth to the fifteenth, during the seventh century. Henceforth, of course, the dogmatic belief of the Spanish, if not of the Western Church generally, was indelibly fixed, and excision of the *Filioque* from the Creed would have appeared nothing short of an abandonment of the faith.

It should be added that the Canon which enjoins the public recitation of the Creed calls it 'the symbol of faith of the Council of Constantinople,' and directs it to be recited 'according to the form of the Eastern Church.' And, as though further to disclaim by anticipation any idea of introducing new articles of faith, they embodied in their canons the famous Ephesine decree already mentioned, which has been so perversely alleged by controversialists on the Eastern side, as though making any such addition as the *Filioque* unlawful. The Bishops at Toledo were evidently quite unaware that they were making any addition to the existing Creed. But there is nothing in the decree of Ephesus to prohibit such additions, still less to prohibit new definitions of faith, when enacted under proper authority and for sufficient cause. To do so would have been to condemn the Council of Constantinople, which had already added several fresh clauses to the Nicene Creed, for it is to the Nicene Creed alone in its original form that the decree refers; and if we are to interpret the decree as the Eutychian and other heretics interpreted it in their own interest, as prohibiting fresh definitions altogether, it would have tied the hands of the Church for all future time in meeting the inroads of any later heresy that might arise. Moreover, it was precisely on this misconstruction of the decree that the heretical *Latrocinium* based its deposition of Flavian, which was reversed and condemned by the Council of Chalcedon. What is really forbidden by the decree is (a) the putting together of any Creed (*πίστις*) at variance with (*ἐτέραν παρά*) the Nicene;<sup>1</sup> (β) by private individuals; and (γ) imposing it on converts from Heathenism, Judaism, or heresy.

It is obvious, from the history itself, that the prohibition is to individual arbitrary acts. It is, that "no one shall be allowed," and the Council annexes an individual penalty to the transgressors of their decree, degradation or excommunication. It is almost superfluous to say, that it was the substitution of a heretical Creed, which was proscribed. There is not an indication that the Council thought that they could fetter the free action of the Church, or meant to do

<sup>1</sup> *πίστις* is used in the Canon of Chalcedon as synonymous with *σύμβολον*, and it evidently bears the same meaning in the earlier canon of Ephesus, referring in both cases to the Nicene Creed.

so. Even with these limitations, all which is forbidden is, to substitute for the Nicene any such different Creed in receiving Jews, heathen, or heretics into the Church. It obviously could not mean to prohibit *true* additions to the Creed of Nice. For the only Creed, which the Council of Ephesus received, was the actual Creed of Nice, which they rehearsed at the beginning of this session. On that other construction they would have condemned the Fathers of the Council of Constantinople, whose Creed they did not themselves receive. For these *did* add to the Nicene Creed, and require subscription to the Creed so augmented.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is strange that an interpretation of the Canon of the 1st Council of Ephesus, which was abused by the Robber-Council to the deposition of S. Flavian, and for which deposition the heads of that Robber-Council were themselves pronounced liable to the same penalty, should still be held valid. The Robber-Council decided in the interests of its President, Dioscorus, and his heresy. But the heresy was kept out of sight. The Robber-Council put forward simply the Canon of Ephesus, with the interpretation, that it forbade all additions beyond the very words of the Creed; it condemned Flavian on this ground only, and deposed him in conformity with the Canon so interpreted. If their interpretation of the Canon was right, the deposition was right. But those of the Robber-Council, who were present at the Council of Chalcedon, confessed that they had been wrong; the judges and senate at that Council pronounced the chiefs of them "subject to the same penalty from the Synod;" the Council approved of that decision.<sup>2</sup>

In this sense the decree was explained by S. Cyril, who subscribed, and probably himself framed it, as president of the Council; and in this sense it was understood by the Council of Chalcedon, which renewed it, and yet included in the Creed, thus guarded from unauthorised innovations, the supplementary clauses of the Constantinopolitan Creed,<sup>3</sup> as well as the explanatory definitions of Ephesus and its own, besides condemning the acts of the *Latrocinium*. Whatever may be thought of the insertion of the *Filioque*, or even of the doctrine it contains, it is to be hoped that henceforth no controversialist with a character to lose will follow the example of Eutyches and Dioscorus at the *Latrocinium*, and Mark of

<sup>1</sup> Pusey's *Letter*, pp. 77, 78.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 88.

<sup>3</sup> Hefele says that 'the more explicit doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost was clearly added in contradiction to the Macedonian or Pneumatomachian errors;' while the words 'whose kingdom shall have no end,' also added to the Nicene Creed at Constantinople, 'were directed against Marcellus of Ancyra.' *Hist. of Councils*, vol. ii. p. 350. But inasmuch as the Pneumatomachians held that 'the Holy Spirit is a creation of the Son, as the Son is a creation of the Unbegotten' (*ib.* p. 223), the addition of either 'from' or 'through the Son' would at that time have suggested an heretical sense.

Ephesus at Florence, by importing into the discussion a canon which has not really the remotest bearing on the subject.

The original objection of the Easterns, however, was not to the addition to the Creed—which had not then become known to them—but to the doctrine itself, which their own earlier Fathers had so unequivocally taught; and it arose out of a controversy on quite a different subject, in which they were entirely in the wrong. The Greek writers of the sixth century do not generally say much about the Procession doctrine; but there is, on the whole, as Dr. Pusey and Mr. Swete are agreed, 'a retreat from S. Cyril's position,' though no explicit denial of it. But when, in the next century, the Monothelite heresy was condemned by the Lateran Council of 649 under Martin I., 'the Monothelite East,' to use Mr. Swete's expression, 'smarting under the Roman anathema,' seized on what they now chose to treat as a departure from the ancient faith, as 'a not unwelcome opportunity of revenge.' It furnished, as Dr. Pusey words it, 'a pretext for those *who wished to pick a quarrel with the West*.' For the West, after the temporary lapse of the Roman See in the person of Honorius, had, throughout the pending controversy, been maintaining the orthodox faith against them. And they accompanied their denial, now for the first time put forward, of the Latin doctrine of the Procession, 'with the blasphemy of alleging it to be an error, that the Lord, as Man, was free from original sin.'<sup>1</sup> We can appeal here to the testimony of their own great Father and Confessor, S. Maximus, who expressly affirms the orthodoxy of the Western doctrine, and its conformity with the teaching of S. Cyril, and calls the objections raised against it 'subterfuges' (*ὑποκλοπὰς*).<sup>2</sup> For the time, however, the misunderstanding passed away, with the final condemnation of the Monothelite heresy at the Sixth Œcumenical Council, or rather, to adopt Mr. Swete's language, 'was suspended till the next outburst of hostilities between Eastern and Western Christendom' in a fresh controversy in the eighth century, where again the Easterns were in the wrong.

And here, in connexion with the Sixth Council, is the place to notice a significant episode in the history of the doctrine of peculiar interest to Englishmen. The primatial see of Canterbury was at that time occupied by an Eastern, Theodore of Tarsus; and Pope Agatho—who naturally felt

<sup>1</sup> Pusey's *Letter*, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup> Both Martin I. and Maximus were rewarded by the Emperor Constans for their inflexible fidelity in resisting the Monothelite heresy with a cruel and lingering martyrdom.

some anxiety as to whether he might have carried with him to his new home any taint of the Monothelite heresy, then so prevalent in the East—sent John, precentor of St. Peter's, to examine and report on the state of belief in the English Church. In consequence apparently of this, the Archbishop summoned a provincial synod at Hatfield, September 17, 680, within two months of the opening of the Third Council of Constantinople, which was postponed till his arrival, so great was the respect felt for him in the East. At this Hatfield synod a profession of faith was drawn up, which, after reciting its adhesion to the five previous General Councils, and the Lateran Synod of 649, proceeds to define the orthodox belief in a formula including the words 'Et Spiritum Sanctum *procedentem ex Patre et Filio* inenarrabiliter, *sicut prædicaverunt hi quos memoravimus supra.*' And this definition is rendered the more remarkable by two circumstances mentioned by Mr. Swete. The acts of the Lateran Synod, of which Pope Agatho had sent a copy to Theodore, contained the original text of the Nicene Creed, which, therefore, the assembled Bishops cannot have supposed they were contradicting by the insertion of *et Filio* in their own 'exposition of the Catholic faith.' And in the next place Bede calls special attention to the fact that all the Suffragans of Canterbury, without exception, subscribed this profession of faith. There can, indeed, be little doubt that the doctrine of the Double Procession had, as Mr. Swete suggests, been brought into England by S. Augustine with Christianity itself, and this may help to account for the peculiar 'tenacity with which the English Church has ever clung to the *Filioque*,' of which he gives several curious and striking illustrations.<sup>1</sup>

There is evidence in the Gallican Liturgy and the works of S. Gregory of Tours, that the doctrine of the *Filioque* was received in Gaul in the sixth century, though the words had not yet found their way into the Creed. But the first synodical discussion of the doctrine, as being matter of dispute between East and West, was at a synod held at Gentilly, near Paris, in 767, the acts of which are not extant. We find, however, from the subsequent statements of Eginhard, Ado,

<sup>1</sup> Thus, *e.g.* every English Bishop at his consecration, and the dying, when prepared for receiving the last sacraments, were expressly required to profess their belief in this as one of the essentials of the Catholic faith. It is worth noting that this national tendency to give prominence to the dogma was rather promoted than checked by the English Reformation, when (1) the simple 'Spiritus Sancte Deus' of the Latin Litany was expanded into 'O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son;' and (2) the doctrine was formally reasserted in the fifth of the Thirty-nine Articles.



four important documents, viz. a Synodical Epistle addressed to the Spanish Bishops from the Bishops of Gaul and Germany; another from Pope Adrian; a letter of Charlemagne; and a treatise of the Italian Bishops against Elipandus (the Adoptionist) composed by Paulinus, Patriarch of Aquileia. In the three first of these documents the *Filioque* is expressly laid down as part of the Catholic faith; but the subject was not discussed at Frankfort. Two years later the insertion of the words in the Creed was for the first time openly defended before a Synod, which assembled at Friuli under the presidency of Paulinus. He argued that as the Council of Constantinople had, for sufficient reasons, added to the original Nicene Creed the 'supplementary exposition' which follows 'et in Spiritum Sanctum,' for the fuller elucidation of the faith, so, when the heretical whisper began to be heard that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *alone*, the *Filioque*—which is really involved in the Nicene *ὁμοούσιος*—was inserted also with good reason and without any change of faith, both forms of the Creed being equally orthodox.<sup>1</sup> By this time the insertion had become known in the East, where it provoked angry reclamations; and in 809 Charlemagne assembled a large Synod at Aix-la-Chapelle to discuss the matter.<sup>2</sup> From this Synod deputies were sent to confer with the Pope, Leo III., who declared himself entirely agreed with them in denouncing as heresy the wilful rejection of the doctrine, but no less inexorably opposed to the insertion of the *Filioque* in the Creed, which had been framed by a Council 'illuminated both with human and Divine knowledge,' to which he would not presume to equal himself; and he added that there were other dogmas equally essential not specified in the Creed. The deputies replied with much force that the unlearned multitude had gained their knowledge of this truth from hearing the Creed sung in the Mass, and that to expunge the words with which they were so familiar would seriously endanger their faith. Leo admitted this, and suggested that the singing of the Creed—which had never been the practice at Rome—should be gradually discontinued, and then the alteration to the

<sup>1</sup> 'Si ergo inseparabiliter et substantialiter est Pater in Filio et Filius in Patre, quo pacto credi potest ut consubstantialis Patri Filioque Spiritus Sanctus non a Patre Filioque essentialiter et inseparabiliter semper procedat?'

<sup>2</sup> The immediate cause of this assemblage was a dispute about the use of the *Filioque* between some Greek and Latin monks at Jerusalem, the latter of whom appealed to the Pope, and quoted in their own defence the chanting of the *Filioque* in the Emperor Charlemagne's chapel, as well as the Athanasian Creed. This appeal Leo III. forwarded to Charlemagne.

and Regino, that the dispute was connected with the controversy about the religious use of images, which had been condemned by the schismatical Council held at Constantinople in 754, under Constantine V. (Copronymus), and claiming Œcumenical authority. Here again the quarrel was revived by the Easterns, and originated in a controversy bearing, though not so directly as the Monothelite, on the doctrine of the Incarnation, in which they were clearly in the wrong. Even so strong a Protestant as the late Dr. Arnold had the sagacity to discern and the candour to acknowledge, what S. John of Damascus had urged a thousand years before, that the prohibition of sacred images (like the crucifix, *c.g.*) in the Old Testament was *ipso facto* annulled by the Incarnation, and it is significant that the first iconoclasts were the Phantasiasts.<sup>1</sup> The discussion at Gentilly, as far as can be gathered from Ado, whose account is the fullest, turned simply on the doctrine of the Procession, and had nothing to do with the form of the Creed. S. John of Damascus, the last theologian—we can hardly, with Dr. Neale, go so far as to call him 'the S. Thomas,'—of the Eastern Church, who flourished during this same century; was apparently, as Dr. Pusey observes, unacquainted with the earlier Greek Fathers, whose language he unreservedly rejects; he certainly knew nothing of the Latin Fathers, though we may believe that he shared their faith, and meant to express it by the formula 'through the Son,' which he uses in several passages, some of which are cited in the third Bonn article, but not those which refer most unequivocally to the Eternal Procession as distinct from the Temporal Mission of the Holy Spirit. To that point we shall have to return presently.

The year after the Synod of Gentilly, Charlemagne ascended the throne, and it was in his reign that the controversy came to a crisis. In 787 the Seventh Œcumenical Council assembled at Nicæa, which condemned the Iconoclasts and sanctioned the formula 'through the Son,' but did not take cognisance in any way of the Western addition to the Creed. In 794 met the Western Synod of Frankfort, in order to discuss the Adoptionist heresy and Iconoclasm, on which last point it blundered;<sup>2</sup> but into these matters we need not follow it here. To the Canons of Frankfort are appended

<sup>1</sup> John of Damascus, whose treatment of the subject is eminently lofty and spiritual, as Neander points out, insisted on the Judaizing and Manichean tendencies of Iconoclasm.

<sup>2</sup> Neander (*Church Hist.* v. 335) points out that the Bishops at Frankfort misrepresented the decree of the Second Nicene Council about images.

older form could be made without attracting general notice. The custom, however, as we have seen, was endeared to the faithful in Spain and Gaul by long usage, and the Pope's advice was naturally not followed. It was not till two centuries later that the chanting of the Creed in the Mass was introduced at Rome by Benedict VIII., at the urgent entreaty of the German Emperor, S. Henry II. Meanwhile Leo III. caused two silver shields, on which the original text of the Creed had been engraved in Greek and Latin, to be hung up in the Confession of St. Peter's. In what Pontificate the insertion of the *Filioque* was first recognised at Rome is still unknown, if, indeed, it ever received formal sanction before the Second Council of Lyons in 1274.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Neale attributes it to Nicholas I., but of this there is no shadow of evidence; and Photius, who was sufficiently unscrupulous in his controversial statements, though he once hinted at such a charge, in several other places expressly admits the contrary to be the fact.

But the tact and moderation of Leo III., as Mr. Swete observes, did not long avail to preserve the peace of Christendom. Within fifty years of his death the controversy was revived in the East; and here, again, the main contention was not against the formula, but the doctrine, and it was again introduced as an after-thought to embitter a quarrel which had originated on wholly different grounds. We cannot enter here on the details of the long struggle between Ignatius and Photius, a clear and impartial account of which will be found in Neander's *Church History*. Suffice it to say that Rome was unquestionably in the right in taking the side of Ignatius against his opponent, a man of great learning and ability but of 'boundless ambition,' to use Milman's words, and utterly unscrupulous as to the means of gratifying it, and a mere catspaw in the hands of the infamous Bardas, who intruded him—while yet a layman—into the Patriarchal See of which Ignatius held canonical possession.<sup>2</sup> It was not till Photius, being disappointed in his attempt to gain the support of Nicholas I., which he had supplicated in terms of abject flattery, had resolved to take revenge by affecting to

<sup>1</sup> It is generally assumed that it was chanted at Rome, where the practice was introduced, in the form universally received throughout the West; and this was probably the case, but there is no direct evidence of it.

<sup>2</sup> It is true that Nicholas I. appealed in support of his supreme authority, in perfectly good faith, to the Isidorian decretals, but that has no bearing on the merits of the controversy itself, wherein, as Neander justly says, 'he was solicitous only for the triumph of right; and to secure this was ever ready to employ the power, which he was convinced that he had received from God.'—*Church Hist.* iv. 303.

excommunicate and depose him, that he issued an encyclical to the Eastern Bishops, in which he accused the Roman Church of teaching erroneous doctrines to the Bulgarian converts in regard to the Procession of the Holy Ghost, the celibacy of the priesthood, and the proper seasons of fasting. And thus, as Neander expresses it, 'the quarrel was turned from a personal one into a controversy between the two Churches.' And to promote this end Photius denounced, not the interpolation, but the doctrine of the *Filioque*, as 'impious and diabolical.'

The fourth and last outbreak of the controversy, which immediately preceded the final breach between East and West, was due to what Neander calls the 'passionate and bigoted zeal' of the Patriarch Michael Cerularius (1043-58), who would not tolerate the use of the Latin rite in certain churches and monasteries at Constantinople. But he put forward as the head and front of their offending, not the *Filioque*, but the heretical use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, in which he chose to detect a Judaizing spirit—whence the Latins were nicknamed 'Azymites' in the East—and he declared this to be the only point in which they erred, and that there was no difference of faith on the Trinity. His attack was answered in an able and temperate treatise by Cardinal Humbert. It was not till after the mission of Papal legates to Constantinople had failed to restore peace—mainly, it would seem, through his own violence and impracticability of temper<sup>1</sup>—that Cerularius put out a fresh and more sweeping indictment against the Roman Church, including all sorts of charges, true and false; among which, *e.g.* is included the alleged refusal of the Latins to honour images and relics. And here, for the first time, reappears the old accusation about the Latin doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Ghost, which was taken up by Peter of Antioch and Theophylact, who, however, dwelt more on the difference of doctrine than on the form of the Creed. Here again, as Dr. Pusey says, it was clearly but an after-thought in the progress of the schism.<sup>2</sup>

We have seen then, that, down to the middle of the seventh century, there was no dispute between East and West on the doctrine of the Double Procession, which had been maintained, both in the forms of 'from the Son' and 'through

<sup>1</sup> This is evidently Neander's opinion.—*Church Hist.* pp. 335, 336. There were, of course, faults on both sides.

<sup>2</sup> Milman, speaking of this as 'the controversy which prolonged for centuries the schism between the Greek and the Latin Churches,' does not even mention the Procession doctrine, but dwells only on the charges of Cerularius about the use of unleavened bread and clerical celibacy.—*Lat. Christ.* iii. 404.

urgent. Perhaps, in the then state of disharmony between the Churches of Antioch and Rome, it was impossible to wait for the Latins, or for the Greek Emperor to invite the Latins. Had this been done, who knows but that the Creed of Constantinople might have been so worded, that this question as to the *Filioque* might never have arisen? But anyhow the principle was established, that the East might, for its own necessities, modify the existing Creed [the Nicene]. Even then, if those in the West, instead of receiving the *Filioque* under a mistaken idea of dutifulness, had introduced the *Filioque*, on any ground of necessity, for their own use, I do not see how this would have been different from the act of the 150 Fathers of Constantinople A.D. 451. They were not a General Council *then*, but a Greek Council.

'So long then as the Latins did not attempt to force the addition upon the Greeks, I cannot see, why they might not have used, without blame, the same formula in the Nicene Creed, which they already had in the Athanasian. It would have been strange that our Western priests should have had to confess in their early prayers, that "the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son," and then in the Communion service to have confessed, "Who proceedeth from the Father." This difference could not, I think, have continued. The Latins need not have sung the Nicene Creed at all. It was an act of devotion adopted from the Greek Church, and intended to assimilate us to it. When the discrepancy was discovered, there was no remedy, without injury to the faith of the people. Leo III., on this ground, advised, not the omission of the clause, while the use of the Creed remained, but the omission of the Creed altogether. Devotion, however, prevailed. The Nicene Creed held its ground against the advice of the Pope; and while it remained, all thought it to be a necessity, that the clause should remain also.

'Since, however, the clause, which found its way into the Creed, was, in the first instance, admitted, as being supposed to be part of the Constantinopolitan Creed, and, since after it had been rooted for 200 years, it was not uprooted, for fear of uprooting also or perplexing the faith of the people, there was no *fault* either in its first reception or in its subsequent retention.'

Dr. Pusey adds that the Greeks would condemn their own forefathers if they pronounced the *Filioque* to be heretical, since the Church cannot hold communion with an heretical body; 'but from the deposition of Photius, A.D. 886, to at least A.D. 1009, East and West retained their own expression of faith without schism,' *i.e.* each retained its own version of the Nicene Creed; the Latins, as they said at Florence, 'did not consider the *Filioque* an addition but an explanation.' Nor was this ever at bottom the real cause of separation. All historians are agreed that the Crusades, the horrors of the

<sup>1</sup> Pusey's *Letter*, pp. 70-72.

the Son,' by the leading Fathers on either side, though the Greeks, during the sixth century, had become gradually oblivious of the teaching of their own earlier theologians. We have seen further that between the middle of the seventh century and the formal separation in the middle of the eleventh, the controversy broke out four times, originating in each case with the Easterns, and in each case growing out of a previous quarrel on some entirely different question where they were in the wrong. It was first introduced when they were smarting under the Roman condemnation of the Monothelite heresy; it was secondly renewed in connexion with Iconoclasm; it was thirdly taken up by Photius, in order to make capital out of it in his personal quarrel with the legitimate occupant of the Patriarchal See which he had usurped; and it was, lastly, put forward, amidst a medley of heterogeneous and merely trivial accusations, by Michael Cerularius, as an after-thought, to justify the schism which he had already precipitated on grounds independent of it. We may add that in the two former controversies the *doctrine* of the Procession was the sole question at issue, without any reference to the additional clause in the Creed, while in the two latter the principal matter in dispute is still the doctrine, and a very subordinate interest attaches to its insertion in the Creed. That the doctrine itself is, by consent of Greek and Latin Fathers alike, involved in the revealed doctrine of the Holy Trinity, being necessarily implied in the Procession from the Father coupled with the Nicene *ὁμοούσιος*, and that a deliberate denial of it logically involves Tritheism, must by this time have become evident to our readers, and will become more evident if they examine for themselves the authorities cited in the volumes under review. As to the insertion of the formula in the Western Creed we cannot do better than sum up the facts of the case in the weighty words of Dr. Pusey:—

'The Greek Church, until the Council of Chalcedon, was in the same condition relatively to the West, as the Westerns are now to the East. The Council of Constantinople became a General Council, because its Creed was, after 71 years, accepted by the whole Church. The Council was not acknowledged by the Council of Ephesus, as neither did the Council of Ephesus receive its Creed. It was received on the ground of its sound exposition of the faith, which the Council of Chalcedon accepted for the whole Church: that faith was not accepted upon *its* authority.

'The subsequent reception of the Creed of Constantinople by the Latins does not alter the original fact, that that Creed was first framed, upon the model of the Nicene Creed, by the Greeks for themselves, to meet heresies, which had sprung up among them. The case was

second capture of Constantinople (1204), and the ill-omened establishment of a Latin Empire and Latin Patriarchate there, had hopelessly estranged the Churches. Milman confirms this view, and Fleury says that the Greeks always believed, whether rightly or wrongly, that the occupation of Constantinople was quite as much an object of the Latins as the recovery of the Holy Land.<sup>1</sup> The reunion overtures at the Councils of Lyons and Florence failed, because they were merely political on the side of the Greeks, while, on the other hand, Rome claimed no longer a primacy only—which the East would have allowed—but the ordinary and absolute jurisdiction asserted in the false decretals. 'The Council of Florence was hopeless from the first, not as to the possibility of harmonizing the two modes of expression as to the Procession of God the Holy Ghost, (which *were* harmonized so happily in its decree,) but because the Emperor miscalculated the temper of his own people,' who were resolved to have no communion with the West unless all their own demands were complied with, including, as the irreconcilable Mark of Ephesus insisted, the excision of the *Filioque* from the Western Creed. It does not clearly appear whether the Pope insisted on the insertion of the clause in the Eastern form, but there was evidently a disposition in other matters to ask too much.<sup>2</sup> And this failure of the last attempt at reunion is the more deeply to be deplored, since, as Mr. Gladstone has lately reminded us, 'had it not been for the religious divisions of East and West, the Turks never could have established their dominion in Europe;'<sup>3</sup> and, we may add, it is only through the continued operation of the unhappy divisions of Christendom that they are able to retain it.

III. The greater part of our task is now accomplished,

<sup>1</sup> Even here, however, the fault was not all on one side. The horrors of the second taking and sack of Constantinople were provoked, though not excused, by the memory of the yet greater horrors of the treacherous massacre of Latins in the same city a century before (1083), of which Gibbon has given so graphic a description (*Decline and Fall*, vii. 454). And it is only fair to remember, as Dr. Pusey observes, that Innocent III. not only sharply denounced the atrocities of the victorious army, but had condemned the whole scheme beforehand, while his subsequent treatment of the matter was marked, according to the impartial testimony of Gibbon, by 'blended prudence and dignity.' Still the establishment of the Latin Empire and Patriarchate, however it be accounted for, and whoever is mainly responsible for it, could not but serve to embitter and perpetuate the schism.

<sup>2</sup> This point is not noticed in the decree of union, which simply defines 'explicationem verborum illorum *Filioque*, veritatis declarandæ gratiâ, et imminente tunc necessitate, licite et rationabiliter symbolo fuisse appositam,' but orders nothing as to the future.

<sup>3</sup> *Contemporary Review*, Dec. 1876, p. 6.



but it is necessary, in conclusion, to exhibit the bearing of the results ascertained on the historical and theological character of the Bonn articles of 1875. This is the leading object of Dr. Pusey's book. Mr. Swete, whose aim is professedly historical, goes over, as we have seen, much of the same ground, but he does not directly discuss this question, though his Essay throws much light upon it. He quotes the text of the doctrinal articles in a footnote, but in an incomplete form, for he omits the appended passages from S. John of Damascus, which form an authoritative (and not very satisfactory) gloss upon them, and, in some cases, materially modify the sense. We need hardly premise here our cordial assent to what Dr. Pusey says as to the duty of doing all we can, by way of explanation, to heal the breaches of Christendom, whether in East or West,<sup>1</sup> and as to the supreme importance, both in principle and practice, of a restoration of visible unity. There is indeed scarcely any sacrifice but one that should not be readily made for an object so dear to every earnest Christian heart; so dear, we may add with all reverence, to the Heart of Christ. But we are still obliged to say, according to the old proverb, 'Amica unitas, magis amica veritas.' As Dr. Liddon himself very justly remarks in his Preface to the English Translation of the *Report*, 'To a serious Christian what God is in Himself must be of much greater importance than any effect of a particular belief about Him upon the political or social fortunes of His creatures.' The proposal to bring these articles under the official notice of the English Convocations led Dr. Pusey to examine the question as one of pressing practical moment; the more so because, as he observes, 'the doctrinal propositions were taken from a writer [S. John of Damascus], who, although he held the same faith with us, formally rejected our language, *whereas there was not a syllable in defence or explanation of that language.*' It will be most convenient, in the first place, to give in full the text of these articles as they stand in the authorised *Report of the Bonn Conference*.

The four preliminary Articles are as follows:—

'1. We agree in accepting the Œcumenical Creeds and the dogmatic decisions of the ancient undivided Church.

'2. We agree in admitting that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Symbolum was not made in a canonical manner.

'3. We adhere on all sides to the form of the doctrine of the

<sup>1</sup> Thus, the late Cardinal Wiseman said in his famous *Letter to Lord Shrewsbury*, of 1841, now out of print: 'We must explain to the utmost;' and he proceeded to argue that in this way the Thirty-nine Articles might be reconciled 'with the decrees of the Tridentine Synod.'

Holy Ghost as it is taught by the Fathers of the undivided Church.

'4. We reject every notion and every mode of expression in which in any way the acceptance of two principles, or *ἀρχαί*, or *αἰρίαι*, in the Trinity would be involved.'<sup>1</sup>

The six doctrinal Articles run thus:—

'1. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father (*ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς*) as the Beginning (*ἀρχὴ*), the Cause (*αἰρία*), the Source (*πηγὴ*) of the Godhead. (*De recta sententia n. 1. Contra Manich. n. 4.*)

'2. The Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son (*ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ*), because in the Godhead there is but one Beginning (*ἀρχὴ*), one Cause (*αἰρία*), through Which all that is in the Godhead is produced. (*De fide orthod. I. 8*; *ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν, Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν.*)

'3. The Holy Ghost issues out of the Father through the Son. (*De fide orthod. I. 12*; *τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκφαντορικῇ τοῦ κρυφίου τῆς Θεότητος δυνάμει τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη.—Ibidem*; *Υἱοῦ δὲ Πνεῦμα, οὐκ ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευομένη.—C. Manich. n. 5*; *διὰ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον.—De Hymno Trisag. n. 28*; *Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ λόγου προῖον.* [The following is the subsequent addition made by the Orientals, to enable them to accept the article.] *Hom. in sabb. s. n. 4*: *τοῦτ' ἡμῖν ἔστι τὸ λατρευόμενον . . . . Πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορευόμενον, ὅπερ καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λέγεται, ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ φανερούμενον καὶ τῇ κτίσει μετὰ διδόμενον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν ὑπαρξίν.*)

'4. The Holy Ghost is the Image of the Son, Who is the Image of the Father (*De fide orthod. I. 13*; *εἰκὼν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα*), issuing out of the Father and resting in the Son as the power radiating from Him. (*De fide orth. I. 7*; *τοῦ Πατρὸς προερχομένην καὶ ἐν τῷ Λόγῳ ἀναπαυομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ οὐραν ἐκφαντικὴν δύναμιν.—Ibidem I. 12*; *Πατὴρ . . . . διὰ Λόγου προβαλεὺς ἐκφαντορικοῦ Πνεύματος.*)

'5. The Holy Ghost is the personal production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because He is the Spirit of the mouth of the Deity, and utters the word. (*De Hymno Trisag. n. 28*; *τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐνυπόστατον ἐκπόρευμα καὶ παράκλημα ἐκ Πατρὸς μὲν, Υἱοῦ δὲ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ Υἱοῦ, ὡς Πνεῦμα στόματος Θεοῦ, λόγον ἐξαγγελτικόν.*)

'6. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is united to the Father through the Son. (*De fide orth. I. 13*; *μέσον τοῦ ἀγεννήτου καὶ γεννητοῦ καὶ δι' Υἱοῦ τῷ Πατρὶ συναπλεγμένον.*)<sup>2</sup>

The first and third of the preliminary articles offer no matter for criticism. But this cannot be said of the other

<sup>1</sup> Report of Conference held at Bonn, 1875, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> Report of Conference held at Bonn, pp. 103, 104.

two. And, while we are concerned here directly with the articles themselves, not with the debates upon them, it is impossible, in estimating the precise force of the language, where there is any room for ambiguity, to put out of sight the comment supplied in the speeches of those who framed or recommended them. The second preliminary article states, as Dr. Pusey accurately renders the German text, 'that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner' ('*nicht in kirchlich rechtmässiger Weise*'); and this, as he observes, 'cannot mean simply that the acceptance of it could not be required of the Orientals,' since that would be a truism. Moreover, Dr. Döllinger stated that the *Filioque* 'was arbitrarily and unlawfully added to the Creed,' that it was 'an illegal addition,' that 'a fault had been committed,' and that this article was 'an admission of the fault,' and 'rectifies, so far as lies in our power, an old wrong.' Bishop Reinkens added that 'the addition was illegally made, by the command of an Emperor,' which is clearly contrary to fact, and that, by acknowledging the illegality, 'the addition is removed from its place as a dogma;' in other words, as Dr. Pusey puts it, the *Filioque* 'is no longer matter of faith.' We have shown already that there was no 'fault' in the matter, and that this proposition accordingly contains a direct misstatement of fact. But that is not the worst. Dr. Döllinger's language suggested the practical inference which Professor Damalas of Athens was not slow to draw, that 'the necessary preliminaries for further examination and discussion are wanting, if you do not remove the "*Filioque*" from the Creed, in accordance with your admissions;' and he therefore very consistently 'prayed our Lord God' to enlighten them further in the matter. It is due to Dr. Liddon to say that he assures us in his Preface that the admission in this article 'was made, not with an eye to any subsequent concessions, but in deference to what was believed [mistakenly, as now appears] to be historical truth.' And no one will doubt that it was in this sense only he accepted, or would ever have accepted, it himself. But we have quoted enough already, and might quote a great deal more, to show that his disclaimer cannot be held to represent the mind of either the Old Catholics or the Easterns. And he himself allows that some 'American divines hinted—it would be more accurate to say that all of them who touched on the question, either in 1874 or 1875, openly asserted—that their Church might effect the change for itself.' And although Dr. Liddon states his conviction that 'to eject the *Filioque* from the Western Creed would entail on the

English Church certain and serious disaster,' other Anglican members of the Conference, such as Dean Howson and Mr. F. Meyrick, spoke in an exactly opposite sense.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Pusey suggests, in place of this misleading and dangerous proposition (second preliminary article) the following amendment:—

'2. "We agree together in acknowledging that the addition of the *Filioque* in the Latin copies of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, having come in under a wrong impression, that it was part of the Creed settled at the Council of Constantinople, and not having itself the authority of any General Council, ought never to have been enforced upon the Greek Church."'<sup>2</sup>

On the fourth preliminary article he observes that its language is 'at best ambiguous,' if it does not involve a distinct repudiation of the *Filioque*. For it was precisely 'the calumny of Photius that' an 'acknowledgment of two principles, or ἀρχαὶ or αἰτίαι, is contained in' that formula. He would, therefore, substitute for a rejection of 'every proposition,' &c., in which such an acknowledgment 'may be contained,' a rejection only of every proposition in which it *is* contained; or more simply—

'4. "We deny the supposition of two principles in the Trinity, as contrary to our belief in the Unity of God."'

We come now to the six doctrinal articles, and here Dr. Pusey proposes in the first place to substitute for the prefatory statement about 'accepting the teaching of S. John of Damascus'—which, as we have seen, is defective if not erroneous in form—the simple statement that

'"We accept the following propositions as agreeable to the teaching of the undivided Church."'

To the first article he has, of course, nothing to object. On the second article he observes, what is plain on the face of it, that in its natural and obvious sense it contains a flat denial of the Procession from the Son. It does not state that the Holy Ghost 'goeth not forth out of the Son, as a Beginning;' and a formula to this effect, when suggested by Dr. Liddon, was rejected, as considered 'insufficient' to satisfy the Orientals, by Dr. Döllinger and Mr. F. Meyrick. The article

<sup>1</sup> Lord Plunket expressly advocated 'the simple removal of the *Filioque*' from the Creed, on the ground that it is desirable to diminish dogmas rather than to multiply them, while another Irish member of the Conference, Master Brooke, repudiated the doctrine itself as unscriptural.—*Report*, pp. 69, 74.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pusey's *Letter*, p. 182.

states *absolutely* that 'the Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son, *because* there is in the Godhead but One Beginning,' &c. And this, as Dr. Pusey points out, is as much as to say exactly what Mark of Ephesus insisted upon at Florence, that any statement of Procession 'from the Son' *must* imply that there is more than one ἀρχὴ in the Godhead. He proposes, therefore, the following amendment:

'2. "The Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son (ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ) as a distinct Source of Being, because there is in the Godhead but one Beginning (ἀρχὴ), one Cause (αἰτία)."'

Or, more briefly:

'2. "The Holy Ghost goes not forth out of the Son as a Beginning or Primary Cause."'

The third doctrinal article is the only one which can by any possibility be represented as a concession on the part of the Easterns to the Western doctrine. They neither consented nor were asked to recognise the truth of the Western formula 'from the Son,' however fully it might be explained. The utmost that could be wrung out of them, and that not very easily, was the statement that 'the Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father *through* the Son.' Dr. Liddon devotes several pages of his Preface to arguing, with much ingenuity, that this is a *virtual* concession of the point at issue;<sup>1</sup> and this in spite of the very suspicious circumstance, on which Dr. Pusey insists, that not one of the explanatory citations from S. John of Damascus defines the Procession through the Son to be eternal, as distinct from temporal mission—although many such passages in his writings could have been found—while the last extract, '*subsequently added by the Orientals to enable them to accept the article,*' refers expressly and exclusively to the Temporal Mission. To say the least, therefore, the Greeks are committed by their third article to nothing beyond the Temporal Mission of the Holy Spirit through the Son, which is less than what they have always unequivocally affirmed. It is true, no doubt, as was shown just now, that 'through the Son,' and 'from the Son,' are expressions applied interchangeably by the Fathers, both Latin and Greek, to the Eternal Procession of the Spirit, and that *per Filium* is therefore equivalent, *in their use of it*, to *Filioque*. This is carefully set forth in the Florentine decree of union, where, as Dr.

<sup>1</sup> He admits that, in 1874, they rejected the Western doctrine absolutely, but thinks that by accepting this article in the second Bonn Conference they 'tacitly abandoned that position'—*Preface*, p. xxxii.

Pusey remarks, 'the two modes of expression are so happily harmonized.' But he adds that 'although "through the Son," in the language of the Greek Fathers, expressed the same doctrine, yet it admitted also a meaning compatible with a denial of the faith, as contained in the baptismal formula given us by our Lord.' It is true also, as Dr. Liddon urges, that 'the Mission of the Spirit from the Son is only a temporal manifestation of an antecedent, or rather eternal relationship in the inner Being of God;' or, in other words, the Mission depends on the Procession. But all this only proves that the orthodox doctrine of the Double Procession is a necessary theological inference from the third Bonn article, rightly understood. So, too, the Catholic doctrine of the *ὁμοούσιος* is a necessary inference from language which the Arians, and still more the Semiarians, did not hesitate to use, when rightly understood; but, inasmuch as the very question at issue was whether they did rightly understand it, their professions were held to be insufficient unless they accepted the crucial test of the *ὁμοούσιος*. Now it is notorious that the Easterns have always maintained the Temporal Mission of the Holy Spirit from the Son, when most strenuously denying that Eternal Procession on which, as Dr. Liddon quite correctly insists, it really depends. What is there, then, to show that in this third article, carefully guarded as it is by explanatory citations, of which, as Dr. Pusey points out, 'the only unambiguous one [which they made a *sine qua non* of signing it] relates only to the Temporal Procession,' they meant to acknowledge the Eternal Procession through or from the Son? On the contrary, so far as any indication of this meaning can be gathered from the discussions, it points, unfortunately, entirely the other way. Thus, e.g. a synodical letter of the Oriental Patriarchs of the seventeenth century was read out by Dr. Overbeck, without a syllable of protest or dissent from any of his brethren, which states that 'there is a twofold Procession of the Holy Spirit; one natural, eternal, prior to time, *according to which He proceeds from the Father alone*; the other Procession is in time and deputative, according to which He is externally sent forth, derived, proceeds and flows from both the Father and the Son.'<sup>1</sup> And, in strict accord with this exposition of doctrine is the statement, more than once repeated, of Professor Janyschew—who took throughout a very leading part in the debates both in 1874 and 1875—that 'the existence of the Holy Spirit' is to

<sup>1</sup> *Report*, p. 7.

be ascribed to the Father only; but His 'manifestation and working,' or 'mission' (πέμψις), also to the Son. And he actually maintains that the passages in Greek Fathers speaking of Procession from the Son refer to this temporal manifestation only. It is clear, then, unless we are to put a still greater strain on their spoken words than on the text of the articles, that the Orientals distinctly repudiated the orthodox inference whereby Dr. Liddon endeavours to establish the soundness of this third article. The addition of a single word, suggested by Dr. Pusey—to which there could have been no possible objection, if they really intended to accept the article in the only sense consistent with the Western doctrine—would have removed all ambiguity. He simply proposes as an amendment—

“The Holy Ghost goes forth out of the Father through the Son eternally.”

Dr. Pusey does not criticise in detail the three last doctrinal Articles. But he intimates generally that they are based on an inadequate consideration of the range of teaching, in both Greek and Latin Fathers, on the subject, and evidently thinks them needlessly obscure and verbose. He also takes pains to show, by copious extracts, that there is abundant authority of Greek Fathers for the procession or production of the Holy Spirit 'from the Son' (ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ), which is a second time denied in the fifth article. True, the word ἐκπορεύεσθαι (*ausgehen*) is not again used in the denial, but that is immaterial to the sense. For we have already found that there is as little traditional as historical or critical ground for the arbitrary distinction between ἐκπορεύεσθαι and 'procedere,' by which it has been sought to vindicate the denial in the first Article. Dr. Pusey puts the matter very clearly when he says that 'the Greeks attach to it a meaning which, by the force of the term, it has not . . . ἐκπορεύεσθαι in itself only signifies to "proceed out of." It does not in itself signify "to proceed out of as the original Source of Being." Nor have they any authority to blame us for not attaching that meaning to our Lord's word in Holy Scripture, or to our own substitute for it, "to proceed from." It does not lie in the word itself, nor has the Church authoritatively so limited its use.' For these three last articles, therefore, which do not further elucidate the point at issue, but rather stand in need of explanation, he proposes to substitute the simple and unambiguous amendment:

“4. “The Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son



*together, since they are essentially one, but principally from the Father."*

As the articles stand in the *Report* it is obvious that the concessions are all on one side. The Westerns explain their doctrine of the Procession to the very verge of explaining it away, or, rather, in two articles—the second and fifth—they virtually deny it; but no reciprocal pledge is offered, or was apparently asked for, from the Easterns, of their readiness to admit the orthodoxy of the doctrine when it had been explained. On the contrary, the only article which can by any ingenuity be represented as implying this is so framed as to 'admit also of a meaning compatible with a denial of the Faith, as contained in the Baptismal formula,' even assuming it to refer to the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost, while the explanatory citations from S. John of Damascus seem to have been studiously selected with a view of restricting it to His temporal mission. We are not here engaged in discussing the policy or results of the Reunion Conference at Bonn, but the great Catholic verity which forms the subject of the two treatises before us, and are only so far concerned with the Bonn articles as they bear upon it. It is not, therefore, necessary to make any comment on the 'unwise and premature' proposal, as Dr. Pusey calls it, which appears to have immediately prompted his *Letter*, and which he so strongly deprecates, that these articles should be submitted for official sanction to the Convocations of Canterbury and York. But whatever may be thought of the propositions in the abstract, and even though they should be deemed 'patient'—some of them certainly cannot be called 'ambitious'—'of a Catholic interpretation,' it is not surprising that he should consider them wholly inadequate, to say the least, to form the basis of a doctrinal concordat, on this question, between the Eastern and Western Churches.

Nor can we omit to notice, in this connexion, a very startling proposition enunciated in a paper 'debated and approved by the Orientals,' and laid by Professor Ossinin, of St. Petersburg, before the Conference, to the effect that 'the Oriental Church calls itself the Orthodox Church, for the very reason that it considers its whole system of doctrine *closed, and rendered for ever unalterable*, by the decisions of the seven ancient Œcumenical Councils, and by the doctrine of the ancient Fathers in agreement with those Councils.'<sup>1</sup> If

<sup>1</sup> *Report*, p. 2. There must surely be some misprint at p. 92 (p. 83 of the German text), where Dr. Döllinger is made to say that 'the Council of Ephesus pronounced no dogmatic decisions.'

this merely means that no doctrine can be propounded *inconsistent with* the faith thus authenticated, it is little more than a truism. But if it means, as the context and occasion of the announcement conspire to imply, that no doctrine not explicitly avouched by these authorities can ever, under any circumstances, be defined, that is to bring back in an exaggerated form the monstrous principle, so forcibly exposed by Dr. Pusey, which had been engrafted by heretics, for the protection of their errors, on a misconstruction of the decree of Ephesus against additions to the Creed.<sup>1</sup> It would be, as he points out, to invest the early Councils with something *more* than infallibility, 'for it would require a Divine prescience that no error would arise in the Church against which it might be necessary to guard by any fresh definition.' It is just as arbitrary to draw such a line at the Seventh Council as at the First or the Fourth, except on the wildly paradoxical hypothesis that thenceforth the Church neither has had, nor ever will have, any fresh assaults of error to contend with. 'Almighty God, who alone knows the future of his Church, could alone know this' beforehand; and experience proves that it is the reverse of being true as regards the past. As a matter of fact we have found that there is the most explicit patristic testimony to the doctrines under review within the limits of time thus specified, though it was not included in any conciliar decree. But even were this otherwise, it would not follow that its promulgation might not become necessary afterwards to guard the integrity of the original deposit against new forms of misbelief, as Dr. Pusey considers that it has actually, 'in the good Providence of God, been a great preventive against heresy, which would not have been guarded against by the Greek formula "through the Son."' If, then, the statement read out by Professor Ossinin means that since the Seventh Council (A.D. 787) all further definitions are unlawful, and it is also meant, as the context seems to indicate, that in this 'whole system of doctrine closed, and for ever unalterable,' is included the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father *alone*, it follows that no reconciliation between East and West is possible, except on condition of the absolute

<sup>1</sup> The more orthodox objectors to the *Filioque*, like Mark of Ephesus and Bessarion, never dreamt of maintaining that the Church could not impose fresh obligatory definitions, but only that they were not to be inserted in the Creed. This is the view maintained by Mr. Ffoulkes, in *Is the Western Church under Anathema?* But even this view we have seen to be untenable.

surrender, not only of the formula, but the substance of the *Filioque* of the Western Creed.<sup>1</sup>

It should be added, in justice to Dr. Liddon, who manifested throughout an appreciation of the gravity of the doctrinal issues at stake, which we are left to desiderate in the speeches of many other members of the Conference, both English and German, that he distinctly asserted his own conviction 'that the *Filioque* expresses a revealed truth with regard to the Divine Nature which can be deduced by a chain of necessary reasoning from Holy Scripture, and is sufficiently testified by tradition from the earliest times.' And he accordingly maintained that the expulsion of the formula from the Creed, in which it had been for many centuries incorporated throughout the whole West, was out of the question, except with the sanction of an Œcumenical Council. This is in substantial harmony with the deliberate judgment of Dr. Pusey, than whom there is probably no man living who has more zealously laboured, through good report and evil report, in furtherance of the great end of the reunion of Christendom, and who tells us, with a pathetic earnestness, that he is now offering his last contribution to a future he will not live to see. These considerations give additional weight to the solemn avowal, here put on record by the great Nestor of Anglican theology, of his conviction on this point:

'One thing is certain, that we must not, in a desire for a premature union, abandon the expression of our faith for at least 1,200 years. However the faith may be maintained by tradition in the East, but, in fact, is certainly, more or less widely, *not* maintained there,<sup>2</sup> we,

<sup>1</sup> In point of fact, we have seen that a profession of faith composed by Tarasius, who presided, and approved by all the other Eastern Patriarchs, was formally sanctioned by the Seventh Œcumenical Council, which defines the Procession of the Holy Spirit 'through the Son'—(Swete, p. 206). The Greek Church at this day requires of converts from Judaism two professions of faith besides the Nicene Creed. (See Le Quien, *Diss. Damasc. de Sp. Sanct.*) An elaborate profession required of the Princess Dagmar on her reception into the Russian Church, corresponding in many particulars with the Creed of Pius IV., will be found at pp. 307 sqq. of Romanoff's *Rites and Customs of the Greco-Russian Church*. The Eastern Patriarchs, moreover, put out a long and precise Confession of faith in 1643, to meet the Protestant tendencies of Cyril Lucar, under the title of *Orthodox Confession of Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church*, which was formally sanctioned by the Synod of Bethlehem in 1672. A great part of the Princess Dagmar's profession appears to be taken from it.

<sup>2</sup> Illustrations of this deplorable fact from past history are supplied in a note. It is true, as Mr. Ffoulkes argues (*Is the Western Church under Anathema?* p. 41), that the doctrine is guarded in the Roman Catholic Church by the decrees of Lyons and Florence (as it is guarded in the

by parting with our inherited expression of it, should forfeit the belief itself, and become misbelievers in our God.'

It can hardly be necessary to add any words of our own to what has been so eloquently urged both by Dr Pusey and Dr. Liddon—that what God is in Himself, as the latter puts it, must be of incalculably greater importance than the practical effect of any particular belief about Him on the fortunes of His creatures. For the point at issue here is no question of ecclesiastical policy, however serious, like the dispute about 'the thrones,' which precipitated the original schism, Constantinople desiring to arrogate a pre-eminence over the other Eastern Patriarchates which did not belong to her, and Rome claiming, in virtue of the forged decretals, a supremacy which was not supported by the general tradition of the Church. It is no question of varying discipline, as in the different practice about clerical celibacy, and the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, which helped to widen the breach. It is not even a question about a divinely ordained hierarchy or the mysteries of sacramental grace. It is a question about the revealed nature and attributes of Almighty God Himself. When all disputes are hushed and all doubts for ever solved, and the Church herself, no longer militant, is transfigured with the light of the Uncreated Vision, and musical with the echoes of the *Sanctus* which dies not day nor night before the Throne, her faithful children, seeing no more through a glass darkly, will gaze face to face on the transcendent Reality, dimly but truly reflected in our earthly creeds, and it will be the sight of the Living God.

The third appendix of Dr. Pusey's book contains a terse and lucid summary of facts respecting the origin of the *Filioque* and its introduction into the Western Creed, in correction of some grave historical errors into which Bishop Pearson has fallen. And this will be found the more serviceable for purposes of reference, inasmuch as the authorities cited in the body of the work are not arranged, as in Mr. Swete's book, in chronological order, but according to their relation to different articles of the Bonn Conference. It is well for readers to bear this in mind, as they might otherwise be perplexed by a seeming want of methodical sequence. And here a remark suggests itself which may have a certain practical value, though it has no proper bearing on the merits of the controversy. There cannot be a more ludicrous mistake than to re-Church of England by the Fifth Article), but that does not meet the *practical* force of Dr. Pusey's argument, which has in fact been recognised from the time of Charlemagne.

gard the *Filioque*, as Orientals, and Orientalisers, if the phrase may be allowed, are apt to do, as a Roman and ultramontane innovation. On the contrary, it found its way into the Creed through a spontaneous popular impulse, spreading from one country to another, not only independently of any Papal authority, but against it; and 'it has been shown,' as Dr. Pusey says, 'that the last place in which the innocently enlarged Creed was received was Rome.' Mr. Swete supplies incidentally a striking illustration of this point in exhibiting the peculiar 'tenacity with which the English Church has ever clung to the *Filioque*.' For the mediæval English Church was conspicuously the reverse of ultramontane. Its most eminent prelates—and we include under that category men so unlike one another in many respects as S. Anselm, S. Thomas of Canterbury, S. Edmund, and Grostête—took their own line irrespective of the policy of Rome, and were either coldly supported by the Popes, or brought into direct collision with them; while, on the other hand, the premature ultramontanism of Bishop Pecock not only excited popular tumults, but exposed him to actual persecution.<sup>1</sup> The two national Churches in communion with Rome, most markedly distinguished for their sturdy—sometimes almost fierce—spirit of independence, were the Gallican and the English. And it is precisely these two which have all along most resolutely adhered to the doctrine of the *Filioque* and its formal definition in the Creed. We might almost apply to the attitude of Rome towards the great body of the faithful in the West, during the controversies on what has been called with paradoxical infelicity a Roman interpolation, the famous comment of S. Hilary on an Arianizing episcopate, '*Sanctiores sunt aures plebis quam corda sacerdotum*.' If ever there was a doctrine authenticated through centuries of persevering enthusiasm, by the *consensus fidelium*, which is one main test of apostolic tradition, it is the doctrine of the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son.

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Pecock of Chichester,—whom Foxe, with characteristic mendacity, has manufactured into a Protestant confessor before the Reformation—was in fact a zealous apologist for the doctrine, then recently broached, of the supremacy of Popes over Councils. He was called upon by Archbishop Stafford to explain his teaching, but escaped further censure, for the moment. Under Archbishop Bouchier he was prosecuted for heresy, condemned, deprived of his See, and imprisoned for life; his works were burnt by the hand of the public executioner, and he only escaped a similar fate himself by abjuration. The Pope, to whom he appealed, issued three Bulls in his favour, but the Primate refused to receive them. The facts are briefly given in Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops*, vol. v.

This fact is brought out with equal and unmistakable distinctness in both the works before us. And it is not a little remarkable that two writers so diverse, if not in theological opinion, in their academical training and antecedents and their whole temperament and habits of thought, who approach the question from different points of view and handle it by different methods, should agree so clearly in the results of the inquiry. Meanwhile we may well cherish the hope with which Dr. Pusey concludes his *Letter*, that the forcible testimonies of their own Fathers, which have now been collected, will not be without effect on the judgment of our Eastern brethren; and that He, in whose Hand alone are the wills and affections of His creatures, will, in His own good time, 'turn the hearts of the children to the fathers,' and once more give us peace.

---

#### ART. VIII.—LIFE OF THE PRINCE CONSORT.

*Life of the Prince Consort.* By THEODORE MARTIN. Vol. II.  
(London, 1876.)

THE production of a Biography in a series of single volumes would not commonly be a safe experiment on the appetite or patience of the public. But, in the present instance, reliance may be placed upon an interest sustained and stimulated by the reason of the case. The whole career of the Prince Consort, and the free exhibition of the life of the Sovereign and the surroundings of the Throne, which it has drawn with it, form a picture which must be interesting, so long as Britons conceive their Monarchy to be a valuable possession; and must be edifying, so long as they are capable of deriving benefit from the contemplation of virtue thoroughly 'breathed' with activity, guided by intelligence, and uplifted into elevated station as a mark for every eye. Mr. Martin's handiwork is well known to the world. It neither calls for criticism, nor stands in need of commendation by way of advertisement. In producing all that can give interest to his subject, free scope seems to have been judiciously allowed him. In one respect only, so far as we can judge, he has been rather heavily weighted in running his race. Perhaps with a view to grati-

fyng the taste of Royal and ex-Royal readers from Germany, he has found it needful to carry his readers somewhat freely into the labyrinthine details of German politics during the years 1848-50, when the Empire was in embryo, and when the attitudes of the various powers and influences at work were imperfectly developed, and for the most part neither dignified nor becoming. The Prince took an active, almost an officious, but a thoroughly patriotic, interest in them ; and if he did not find a clew to guide him through the windings, or disclose any signal gift of political prophecy in what he wrote, he, at least, set a good example in his disposition to cast aside the incumbrances of dynastic prejudice, and hold language which had justice and liberality for its rule. It may seem singular, but we take it to be the fact, that he applies a stronger and sharper insight to the Eastern question, as it emerged in 1853, than to the problems offered to his notice by the land of his birth.

The main interest, however, of this Biography, which is, we believe, to secure for it a place in our permanent literature, will not, perhaps, be found to lie so much in the treatment of this or that current question of its time, as in the figure and character of the man, as a man, who is its subject, in the light it throws upon the difficult question of his position as a Prince Consort, and in the contribution it supplies towards defining that important position for the future as well as for the past.

The excellence of the Prince's character has become a commonplace, almost a by-word, among us. It is easy to run round the circle of his virtues : difficult to find a point at which the line is not continuous. He was without doubt eminently happy in the persons who principally contributed from without to develop his capacities, and determine his mental and moral, as well as his exterior, life ; namely, in his uncle, his tutor, and his Wife. But how completely did the material answer to every touch that it received ; how full, round, and complete it was, as a sculpture ; how perseveringly and accurately did the Prince apply a standing genial conception of duty and action to the rapid stream, it might be said, the torrent, of the daily details of life ; how much of interest—amidst incessant action, and without the tranquillity necessary for systematic thought—he presents to the class who have no taste for mere action, to the philosophic student ; how nearly the life approximates to an ideal ; how it seems to lay the foundations for a class and succession of men, if only men could be found good enough, and large enough, to build themselves upon



it. Mr. Martin has been impugned by an acute writer<sup>1</sup> for the uniformity of his laudatory tones. Now, doubtless, it would be too much to expect a drastic criticism of the Prince's intellect in a work produced under the auspices of an adoring affection; but an honest impartiality prompts us to ask whether in the ethical picture here presented to us there really is any trait that calls for censure. If there is anything in the picture of the Prince that directly irritates the critical faculty, is it not

‘That fine air;  
That pure severity of perfect light,’<sup>2</sup>

which was insipid to Queen Guinevere in the heyday of her blood, but to which she did homage when the equilibrium of her nature was restored?

There can be little doubt that the Prince will be remembered in future generations with something quite different from that formal and titular remembrance, which belongs to his rank in its relation to the Throne, and which is accorded to Prince George of Denmark. There has not yet been time to determine his exact place among the inheritors of renown, fulfilled or unfulfilled. The silly importunity which has urged Pope Pius IX. to dub himself ‘The Great’ was doubly wrong: wrong, as we think, in urging him to clutch at what he will never get: wrong, beyond all question, in requiring him to fabricate at a stroke a title which has not, and, from its nature, cannot have, yet inured: inasmuch as it can only be conferred by the general sense of an impartial, that is, a succeeding age.<sup>3</sup> For it is thus alone that the phrase acquires its dignity: *securus judicat orbis terrarum*; manufactured by a contemporary *clique*, it is entitled to no more respect than the forged antiquities, which are daily passed off upon the ravenous appetite of collectors. All that we can venture in this case to propound is, that, with every fresh gush of light upon the Prince's personal history, there is a corresponding growth in his claims to admiration and celebrity, and an intimation of his finally taking a higher rather than a lower place among the departed sons of fame.

At the same time, it would probably be too much to hope that the third volume of Mr. Martin will raise the Prince above the second, as the second has, we think, raised him above the first. The period of the Great Exhibition of 1851, which entailed upon him arduous and constant labour, was

<sup>1</sup> *Nonconformist*, Dec. 9, 1876.

<sup>3</sup> Shelley's *Adonais*.

<sup>2</sup> Tennyson's *Guinevere*.

probably the climax of his career. This narrative appears to establish his title to the honours of its real origination.<sup>1</sup> Its nearest analogue in past history would appear to have been the Frankfort fair of the sixteenth century. The mischievous system of narrowing the usefulness of commerce for mankind by what was called Protection had not then been methodised; and the productions of different countries, where adequate channels were open, flowed by a natural process to a common centre. But great discoveries are commonly to be found in germ, either unobserved or imperfectly developed, long before their publication, which marks the stage of maturity in their idea, and makes them part of the general property of mankind. So came the printing-press, so came the steam-engine; and, in this sense, when on July 30, 1849, twenty-one months before the opening, the Prince propounded at Buckingham Palace his conception of the Great Exhibition, as it might be, to four members of the Society of Arts, he established his title to the practical authorship of a no small design. In it were comprised powerful agencies tending to promote the great fourfold benefit of progress in the industrial arts, of increased abundance or diminished stint of the means of living among men, of pacific relations between countries founded on common pursuits, and of what may be termed free trade in general culture.

It was a great work of peace on earth: not of that merely diplomatic peace which is honeycombed with suspicion, which bristles with the apparatus and establishments of war on a scale far beyond what was formerly required for actual belligerence, and which is potentially war, though still on the tiptoe of expectation for an actual outbreak. It was a more stable peace, founded on social and mental unison, which the Exhibition of 1851 truly, if circuitously, tended to consolidate. And if, in the quarter of a century which has since elapsed, counter influences have proved too strong for the more beneficial agencies, let us recollect that many of the wars which have since occurred have been in truth constructive wars, and have given to Europe the hope of a more firmly knit political organisation; and that, even if this had not been so, the influences of theory and practice associated with the Great Exhibition would still have earned their title to stand along with most other good influences in the world, among things valuable but not sufficient.

During the last decade, however, of his years, from 1852

<sup>1</sup> Chap. xxxv. vol. ii. 223-5.

to 1861, wars, as well as rumours of wars, became the engrossing topic of life and thought to many a mind which, if governed by its own promptings, by the true direction and demand of its nature, would have batted only on the pastures of national union and concord. The Crimean War,—with its fore and after-shadows, began early in 1853, and closed in 1856; it was followed by the Indian Mutiny, and this by the French war panic of 1858–60, which, more than any other cause, encouraged as it was by no small authorities, altered the disposition of the British people in a sense favourable to, and even exigent of, enlarged military and naval establishments. This, we think, was a great misfortune to the Prince, in regard both to the mental movement which required a congenial atmosphere and exercise, and to the eventual greatness which was its natural result. He was properly, and essentially, a man of peace. The natural attitude of his mind was not that of polemical action, but of tranquil, patient, and deliberate thought. It was as a social philosopher and hero that he was qualified to excel, rather than as a political or military athlete. It is true, indeed, that the searching fire of continual struggle educated those royal personages, whose destiny in other days or other lands has lain beyond the precincts of the constitutional system. But it is the very pith and essence of that system to remove from sovereigns, and to lay upon their recognised and official servants, the heavier portions of that responsibility and strain, under which a governing will, lodged in a few human brains, or in one only, takes up into itself, and directs, while controlling, the collected force of an entire community. Doubtless even now royalty—we speak of constitutional royalty—acts out in idea, with a certain reality, the contentions which it observes and superintends, and with which at particular points it may actually intermix; but, as a rule, its share in them is an indirect and mediate share. Princes are rather moons than suns in the political firmament; and the tranquil atmosphere in which they dwell, while more favourable in some of its aspects to a reflective and impartial habit of mind, is not calculated to foster the strongest tissue, or develop the hardest forms, of character. While the Peers of England are more remote than the Parliamentary Commoners from living contact with the great seething mass of a highly vitalised community, and while the popular House must, with all its faults, remain, so long as the Constitution keeps its balance, our highest school of statesmanship, so the Throne, though vexed more than enough with labours and with worries of its own, yet in rela-

tion to the sea of political strifes, remains sheltered within an inner and landlocked haven, and the mental habits which it tends to generate will be less masculine though more amiable accordingly.

If there is force in these remarks, they will apply scarcely more to a constitutional sovereign, than to one who attained to such a degree of moral and mental identification with the greatest of all constitutional sovereigns as did the Prince Consort. They have also a peculiar and individual application to a mind, the rich gifts of which were not wayward and unruly, but fitted themselves at every point into the mould supplied for them by his position, and became in consequence an admirable and typical example of what that position, genially apprehended and employed, is calculated to produce.

In this view, those who most highly estimate the Prince's work may well regret that the line of mental movement represented by the Great Exhibition came soon to be deflected towards a different region of human activity. In that region, mankind at large is at once excited and morally enfeebled by rivalries and conflicts hardly ever in their outset generous, and marred from the beginning of the world by their tendency to degenerate, from their first intentions, in the direction of more violent and wide-sweeping passions, more greedy selfishness, and deadlier feuds.

A parallel may be drawn between the Prince Consort and Mr. Pitt, in regard to one striking characteristic of their respective careers. They were both men loving peace. Each of them began, very early in life, to hold a position of high command, and of profound importance to the public welfare, in the midst of pacific ideas, plans, and expectations. Each of them achieved a reputation of the highest order in connexion with this line of thought and action. Upon each of them, and singularly enough upon each of them at the age of thirty-three, there fell what, but for the knowledge that in all mysteries of our life there lies hid but a deeper and larger Providence, we might call an ugly trick of Fortune; an imperious change, not in the man, but in external circumstances which overrule the man, and which carry him, perforce, out of a work well beloved, and more than well begun, into a place and function of opposite conditions, less congenial, and less adapted to favour the development of his character, by leading him up to the highest point of its capacity. Before 1853, England had only to look with sympathy upon the sufferings and disorders of the Continent, while she watched and made provision for her own internal condition. But from that day until the sad day of

the Prince's death, she was ever in actual struggle, or in anticipation of struggles deemed probable ; and this great change in the nature of the cares and occupations offered to the Prince, the normal bill of fare, so to speak, made ready for him, was to him very much what the Revolutionary War was to Mr. Pitt. With a difference indeed of degree, for the Prince was not overweighted and absorbed, as Mr. Pitt was from 1793 onwards ; but, with an identity of general outline, each of these changes broke up the perfect harmony that subsisted between the man and his occupation, and probably abstracted something from the ultimate claims of each to pre-eminent renown.

The Prince's life from day to day was, however, not a life fashioned by haphazard, but one determined by conscientious premeditation. What he said, he had usually written ; what he did, he had projected. When an important subject presented itself, his tendency and practice was to throw his thoughts on it into shape, and to harmonise its practical bearings with some abstract principle. Though a short, it was a very full and systematic life. So regarding it, we may say that his marital relation to the Sovereign found a development outwards in three principal respects. First, that of assistance to the Queen in her public or political duties. Secondly, in the government of the court and household. Thirdly, in a social activity addressed to the discovery of the wants of the community, and reaching far beyond the scope of Parliamentary interference, as well as to making provision for those wants, by the force of lofty and intelligent example, and of moral authority.

The public mind had for the moment lost its balance at the particular juncture, when for the first time the intervention of the Prince in public affairs became a subject of animadversion. It was at the beginning of 1854, during the crisis of expectation before the Crimean War, the calm that precedes the hurricane. A very short time, and a single day of explanations from Lord Aberdeen and Lord Russell, then the leaders of the two Houses of Parliament, sufficed to set right a matter which we now wonder that any should have had either the will or the power to set wrong. It was a matter of course that the Queen's husband should be more or less her political adviser ; it would have been nothing less than a violence done to nature if, with his great powers and congenial will, any limits had been placed upon the relations of confidence between the two, with respect to any public affairs whatsoever. Had he been an inferior person, his interference would doubtless have been limited by his capacity. But, he being, as he was, qualified to examine, comprehend, and give counsel, the two minds

were thrown into common stock, and worked as one. Nay, it does not even seem easy to limit the Sovereign's right of taking friendly counsel by any absolute rule to the case of a husband. If it is the Queen's duty to form a judgment upon important proposals submitted to her by her Ministers, she has an indisputable right to the use of all instruments which will enable her to discharge that duty with effect ; subject always, and subject only, to the one vital condition that they do not disturb the relation, on which the whole machinery of the Constitution hinges, between those Ministers and the Queen. She cannot, therefore, as a rule, legitimately consult in private on political matters with the party in opposition to the Government of the day ; but she will have copious public means, in common with the rest of the nation, for knowing their general views through Parliament and the Press. She cannot consult at all, except in the strictest secrecy : for the doubts, the misgivings, the inquiries, which accompany all impartial deliberation in the mind of a Sovereign as well as of a subject, and which would transpire in the course of promiscuous conversation, are not matters fit for exhibition to the world. The dignity of the Crown requires that it should never come into contact with the public, or with the Cabinet, in mental dishabille ; and that its words should be ripe, well-considered, few. For like reasons, it is plain that the Sovereign cannot legitimately be in confidential communication with many minds. Nor, again, with the representatives of classes or professions as such, for their views are commonly narrow and self-centred, not freely swayed, as they ought to be, by the paramount interests of the whole body politic. We have before us, in these pages, a truly normal example of a personal councillor of the Queen for public affairs in her husband ; and another, hardly less normal, in Baron Stockmar. Both of them observed all along the essential condition, without which their action would have been not only most perilous, but most mischievous. That is to say, they never affected or set up any separate province or authority of their own ; never aimed at standing as an opaque medium between the Sovereign and her Constitutional advisers. In their legitimate place, they took up their position behind the Queen ; but not, so to speak, behind the Throne ; they assisted her in arriving at her conclusions, but those conclusions when adopted were hers and hers alone : she, and she only, could be recognised by a Minister as speaking for the Monarch's office. The Prince, lofty as was his position, and excellent as was his capacity, vanished as it were from view, and did not, and could not, carry, as towards them, a single ounce of ultimate authority.



If he conferred with Lord Palmerston on matters of delicacy, belonging to the relation between the Sovereign and the Secretary of State, it could only be as the Queen's messenger, and no word spoken by him could be a final word. He was adjective, but the Queen the only substantive. As the adjective gives colour to the substantive, so he might influence the mind of the Queen; but only through that mind, only by informing that supreme free-agency, could his influence legitimately act; and this doctrine, we apprehend, is not only a doctrine wholesome in itself, but also indisputable, nay, what is more, vital to the true balance of the English monarchy. On the other hand, as the Queen deals with the Cabinet, just so the Cabinet deals with the Queen. The Sovereign is to know no more of any differing views of different Ministers, than they are to know of any collateral representatives of the monarchical office; they are an unity before the Sovereign, and the Sovereign is an unity before them. All this, it will be observed, is not a description of matters of fact, but a setting forth of what the principles of our monarchy presuppose; it is a study from the closet, not the forum or the court; and it would have been more convenient to use the masculine gender in speaking of an abstract occupant of the Throne, but for the fact that we have become so thoroughly disused to it under the experience of forty happy years.

Nice and sound, however, as would appear to have been the application of these principles to practice, on the part of Baron Stockmar, and, in his higher and more difficult position, of the Prince, we take leave to question the theoretic representation<sup>1</sup> set forward by the one, and accepted by the other; as well as countersigned by the biographer, at a period of calm very different from the political weather which prevailed at the moment of its production. This representation is conveyed in a long letter, dated January 5, 1854, and consisting of two parts. In the second and much the shorter of the two, it is held that the Prince 'acts as the Queen's private secretary, and that all else is simply calumnious;' and the right of Her Majesty to the assistance implied under this modest name is justly vindicated (pp. 554-7). But the first portion of the letter contains a Constitutional dissertation, which was in no manner required for the support of these rational propositions, and which is based, as we think, mainly upon misconception and confusion, such as we should not have expected from a man of the Baron's long British experience and acute percep-

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. pp. 545-57.



tions. His main propositions appear to be these : that again and again, since the Reform Act, Ministers have failed to sustain the prerogatives of the Crown ; that the old Tories, who supported these prerogatives, were extinct, and that the existing Tories were (p. 546) 'degenerate bastards ;' that the Whigs and 'politicians of the Aberdeen School' were conscious or unconscious republicans ; that the most jealous Liberalism could not object to 'a right on the part of the King to be the permanent President of his Ministerial Council' (p. 547) ; that Premiers were apt to be swayed by party interests ; that no penalty for Ministerial obliquities now remained but that of resignation ; that this was insufficient to secure good conduct from the bad or the incapable ; that the Sovereign should take part at the deliberations of his Council ; that the centre of gravity had been shifted by the Act of 1832 from the House of Lords to the House of Commons ; that a well-merited popularity of the Sovereign was to support the House of Lords against the dangers of democracy, and his direct action in the Government to be a *vis medicatrix nature* (p. 551) for maintaining prerogative, and for supplying all defects by a judgment raised above party passions. Yet the right of the Crown is to be merely moral (p. 549) ; and in the face of it, Ministers would act, as to their measures, with entire freedom and independence ; but, as to policy and administration, the Sovereign is primarily charged with a control over them, which he should exercise through the Premier (p. 549).

Thus the Baron. A congeries of propositions stranger in general result never, in our judgment, was amassed in order to explain to the unlearned the more mysterious lessons in the study of the British Monarchy. Taken singly, some of them are truisms, others are qualifications, which usefully restrain or neutralise the companion statements. Some also are misstatements of history ; others of fact. For example—The Parliamentary Constitution had its centre of gravity in the House of Commons, not in the House of Lords, before, as well as after, the Reform Act. The House of Lords, in fact, has resisted the will of the House of Commons since the Reform Act, more than it did before the passing of that great statute. The gravest change then effected in regard to the House of Lords was this: that, under the old system, the Peers had in their own hands the virtual appointment of a large section of the House of Commons ; whereas now, although their influence in elections is still great, it is exercised through and by what is supposed to be, and in general is, a popular and voluntary vote. The Reform controversy was

admirably argued on both sides, not perhaps worse on the side of the opponents of Reform ; some of whom, following up a subtle disquisition of philosophical politics in a previous number of the *Edinburgh Review*, pointed out unanswerably that singular economy, by which the old close boroughs had cushioned off, as it were, the conflicts between the two Houses ; and then predicted with truth, though likewise with exaggeration, that when once the House of Lords ceased to assert and express itself by this peculiar method within the House of Commons, it would be driven upon the alternative of more frequently pronouncing an adverse judgment.

Again, Baron Stockmar teaches that the prerogatives of the Crown had been abandoned by successive Ministries, and had no longer any party ready to defend them. It would be much nearer the truth to say that there was no longer any party disposed to assail them. But what means the Baron by 'the prerogatives of the Crown?' Are they prerogatives as against the Ministers? or prerogatives as against the Parliament, or the popular branch of it? As against the Ministers, the Sovereign's prerogatives before the Reform Act were : firstly, that of appointing and dismissing them ; secondly, that of exercising an influence over their deliberations, which was, as the Baron says, in one of his qualifying passages, in the nature of a moral right or influence. The first of these is virtually a right of appeal from the Cabinet to the Parliament, or the nation, or both : and no such conspicuous instance of its exercise can be cited from our pre-Reform history, as was supplied by William IV. after the Reform Act, in the month of November, 1834, with no sort of reason and (it is true) without success, but also without any strain to the Constitution, or any penalty other than the disagreeable sensation of being defeated, and of having greatly strengthened and reinvigorated by recoil the fortunes of the party on whom it had been meant to inflict an overthrow. As regards the prerogative or power, which gives the Monarch an undoubted *locus standi* in all the deliberations of a Government, it remains as it was : and it is important or otherwise, exactly in proportion to the ability, the character, the experience, and, above all, the attention, which the Sovereign of the day brings to bear upon it. If there be differences, they are not such as Baron Stockmar indicates. It is, indeed, certain that the Monarch has to deal with the popular power in a proximate, instead of a remote position : but so have the Ministers ; and likewise that there was once a party of King's friends (as well as a large number of the nominees of Peers), within the House of

Commons, by means of whom he could operate to a certain extent, in an unavowed manner, upon or against his Ministers. But of this party we lose all trace after the reign of George III.; so that it supplies no standing ground for the Baron. It is, perhaps, also true that the subordination in the last resort of the royal to the national will, when expressed through the Constitutional organs, which was fact before the Reform Bill, has been patent and admitted fact since that measure became law. The dying throes of independent kingship gave for a moment a real pang to the self-centred mind of George IV., and even imparted a certain interest to his personality, when after many struggles he consented or gave way to the Bill for Roman Catholic Emancipation in 1829.

Baron Stockmar, however, appears to confuse the prerogatives of the Crown, which are really represented by ministerial action in the face of the Legislature, with the personal rights of the Sovereign in the face of and as towards his or her Ministers. And here the question must be cleared by another distinction, of which, in this rather confused and very disappointing letter, he takes no notice: the distinction between the statutory powers of the Crown and those immemorial and inherent powers, which have no written warrant, which form the real and genuine prerogative, and which form a great oral tradition of the Constitution: resembling in their unwritten character what is called the privilege of Parliament, but differing from it in that they are perfectly well defined. In the mouth of Baron Stockmar, the plural word Prerogatives appears to include both classes of three powers, which only ignorance can confuse, though sometimes, even in high official places, ignorance does effectually confuse them. Accepting the phrase for the moment, we ask which of these statutory prerogatives have, since the Reform Act, been forfeited or impaired through the timidity of the Governments down to 1854, or, we might perhaps add, of succeeding Governments? The question is most important, for, by dint of the prerogative proper and these statutory powers, the Ministers, sustained as they are by the Sovereign behind them, form a great part, not only of the executive or deputed, but of the ultimate and supreme governing force in this country. To test the doctrine of Baron Stockmar, let us enumerate some examples of the vigour of the powers of the Crown. We have already spoken of the great prerogative of dismissal of Ministers as it was illustrated in 1834. Surely the prerogative of appointment of Bishops sufficiently proved its animation, against the remonstrance of the Primates and a body of their Suffra-

gans, in the case of Dr. Hampden. The prerogative of peace and war did the same in 1857, when Lord Palmerston carried on, at the charge of the country, a war in China, which the representatives of the people, the stewards of the public purse, had condemned : and when, upon the election to which he had recourse, he received the sanction of the country for what he had done. And the prerogative of dissolution must have been in a healthy state in 1852, to enable a government, supported only by a minority, to perform the work of the session, and carry the supplies before asking the judgment of the constituencies on its title to exist. There is but one prerogative of the Crown, so far as we are able to read the Constitutional history of the country, or rather but one of any great significance, which has suffered of late years. It is the initiative in proposing grants of public money. This prerogative, if such it is to be called, has been seriously and increasingly infringed, to the great detriment of the nation. And this by a double process. The House of Commons was very rarely disposed, before the Reform Act, to press upon the Administration of the day new plans or proposals involving public outlay. After the Reform Act, there was manifested a vicious tendency to multiply these instances, which, however, produced no very serious consequences for the first twenty or twenty-five years, but which has become a great public mischief, since the increasing wealth of the most active and influential classes of the country has brought about a greater indifference to economy in the public expenditure. Local claims, and the interests of classes and individuals, are now relentlessly and constantly pressed from private and irresponsible quarters, and, though the House of Commons still maintains the rule that money shall not be voted except on the proposal of the Crown, yet it permits itself to be pledged by Addresses, Resolutions, and even the language of Bills and Acts, to outlay in many forms, and these pledges it becomes morally compulsory on Governments in their turn to redeem. But besides the activity of private, professional, and local greed, and the possible cowardice of Ministers in resistance, the House of Lords has done very great mischief in this respect, by voting into Bills the establishment of officers and appointment of salaries, and sending these Bills to the Commons with all such portions printed in italics, a conventional expedient adopted in order to show that they are not presented as parts of the Bill, but only as indications of the view or wish of the House of Lords ; in matters, however, in which they have as a body no more right or title to any view or wish at all, than

the House of Commons has or had to send in italics, or by any other subterfuge, to the Lords a direction as to the judgments to be given in appeals. Here, then, we have a real case in which a power of the Crown has been greatly and mischievously weakened. But this is a power which probably forms no part of prerogative properly so called. We apprehend that it rests upon no statute, but only on a wise and self-denying rule of the House of Commons itself. The Crown, as such, has no immediate interest in it whatever; and there is not the smallest reason to suppose that Baron Stockmar knew to what solid truth in this one respect he was giving utterance, or that he in any way cared about the matter.

There is, indeed, one genuine Crown right which has been somewhat disparaged of late years, and that is its title to the Crown Lands. By degrees, it became the custom for the Sovereign, on accession, to surrender the life-interest in these properties to the State, in return for a life-income called the Civil List. But this transaction in no way affected the legal right of the next heir to resume the lands on the expiry of the arrangement. It is undeniable that members of Oppositions, and the blamable connivances of party, have of late years, in various instances, obtained by pressure from the Governments of the day arrangements which touch the reversionary interest. The question is too complex and many-sided for exposition here: but it may be said with truth, first, that the State has dealt liberally as a tenant under a life-lease with the estates given to its control; and, secondly, that the subject is in a constitutional view a small one. Neither shall we here investigate the curious doctrine—in one sense novel, and in another obsolete—of those who contend that the Sovereign has a peculiar relation to the Army, involving some undefined power apart or different from its general relation to the executive portion of the business of government. We shall only observe that, in this country, the standing Army is itself extra-constitutional, and that its entire dependence upon Parliament has been secured, not as in the case of the Civil Services by a single provision, that of requiring annual votes for its support, but also by the further precaution of granting only by annual Mutiny Acts those powers for enforcing discipline which are necessary for its management. Not even a colourable plea can be set up for an exceptional power or prerogative in respect to the Army.

As to the occasion of Baron Stockmar's letter to the Prince, the truth seems to have been this: A most unreasonable

and superficial clamour had been raised against the intervention of the Prince as a counsellor, an adviser, in the performance of the Queen's public duties: a clamour due to the peculiar susceptibilities of his time, the aberration of a portion of the press, and the very undue disposition of what is questionably called 'good society' to canvass in an ill-natured manner the character and position of one who did not stoop to flatter its many vulgar fancies, and whose strictly ordered life was a continual though silent rebuke to the luxurious licence that large portions of it love and habitually indulge in. Instead of dealing with this practical matter in a practical manner, Baron Stockmar was unhappily tempted to stray into the flowery fields of theory. *S'aviò sui floridi sentier.* His constitutional knowledge, apart from his working common sense, which he did not think good enough for so high an occasion, was, after all, only an English top-dressing on a German soil: and hence he has given a perfectly honest but a most misleading exposition of a great subject, highly needful to be rightly apprehended everywhere, and of course most of all in courts.

One of his propositions is that the King, if a clever man—for so (p. 549) it seems to be limited, and we do not envy those who would have to pronounce the decision 'Aye' or 'No' upon the point, nor indeed do we know who they are—shall 'make use of these qualities at the deliberations of his Council.' Now this, to speak with a rustic plainness, is simply preposterous. We take first the ground which would be called the lowest. If the Sovereign is to attend the Cabinet, he must, like other Cabinet Ministers, adapt his life to its arrangements, spend most of the year in London, and when in the country be always ready to return to it at a moment's notice. Perhaps it may be thought that, as would be only seemly, Cabinets could, as a rule, be postponed to suit the convenience of so august a personage. It would be almost as easy to postpone the rising of the sun. But let us suppose him there, not on his throne, but in his arm-chair. He must surely preside; and in that case what becomes of the First Minister? It is a curious, but little observed, fact of our history, that the office of First Minister only seems to have obtained regular recognition as the idea of personal government by the action of the King faded and became invisible. So late as in the final attacks upon Sir Robert Walpole, it was one of the charges against him that he had assumed the functions of First Minister. The presence of the King at the Cabinet either means personal government—that is to say, the reservation to him of all final



decisions which he may think fit to appropriate—or else the forfeiture of dignity by his entering upon equal terms into the arena of general, searching, and sometimes warm discussion ; nay, and even of voting too, and of being outvoted, for in Cabinets, and even in the Cabinets reputed best, important questions have sometimes been found to admit of no other form of decision. Now such is the mass, detail, and technical difficulty of public affairs, that it would be an absolute cruelty to the Sovereign to put him through these agonies ; for it is no trifling work and pain to hammer into form the measures and decisions which are, when promulgated, to endure the myriad-minded, myriad-pointed criticism of the Parliament, the press, and the country. At present the Sovereign is brought into contact only with the net results of previous inquiry and deliberation, conducted by other and, as the Constitution presumes, by select men. The Baron's proposal is to immerse him in the crude mass of preliminary pleas and statements, to bring him face to face with every half-formed view, to compel him to deal with each plus and minus, known and unknown, quantity in and by itself, instead of submitting to him only the ascertained sum of the equation. The few remarks now offered are far indeed from exhibiting exhaustively the huge demerits of this unwise proposal ; but they may serve to prove or indicate that either, while intolerably cumulating labour, it must sorely impair dignity and authority ; or, if it aims at preserving these, the end can only be gained by making the King the umpire and final arbiter of deliberations, to which he listens only for the assistance of his own judgment. That is, they not simply alter, but overturn, the Constitution, by making a personal will supreme over the ascertained representative will of the nation.

If, however, the office of the First Minister would have suffered by the last-named proposal, it seems that compensation was to be given him at the expense of his colleagues. We shall not record any dissent from the general view of the remarkable controversy between the Crown, or Court, and Lord Palmerston ; which is to the effect that, in the main, the Sovereign was right in demanding time and opportunity, of course with a due reserve for the exigencies of urgent business, for a real, and not merely a perfunctory consideration of draft despatches. But with this there seems to have been combined a demand that the drafts of the Foreign Minister should be submitted to the Sovereign only through the head of the Government. It is laid down (p. 300) that the First Minister, as well as the Foreign Secretary, is bound to advise the Crown on



questions of Foreign policy ; and, we are told, it was accordingly demanded (p. 302)—

‘That the despatches submitted for her approval must therefore pass through the hands of Lord John Russell, who, if he should think they required material change, should accompany them with a statement of his reasons.’

It is unquestionable that the Prime Minister, who is entitled to interfere with, and in a well-organised Cabinet is constantly invoked by, every department, has a special concern in Foreign affairs. He will, therefore, have something to say upon the drafts prepared by his colleague. But this, according to the sound law of established practice, he will say to his colleague ; and the draft, as it goes to the Sovereign, will express their united view. Instead of this, the proposal seems to have been that the drafts prepared by the Foreign Minister should be discussed and settled between the Prime Minister and the Sovereign. Now almost any system may be made workable by considerate and tender handling ; but the method now before us, issued as a hard abstraction, would justly be said to degrade an office of a dignity and weight second to none after that of the Head of the Government. The transmission through the First Minister seems indeed to have been agreed to, wrongly as we think, by Lord Palmerston (p. 309) ; and Stockmar in his Memorandum apparently extends this system to all the Ministers, for he says that the control of the Sovereign would be ‘exercised most safely for the rest of them through the Premier.’ Thus the Premier would stand between them and the Sovereign. The Baron failed to perceive that this involves a fundamental change in their position : their relations to the Crown become mediate instead of immediate ; they are no longer the confidential servants of Her Majesty ; he is the sole confidential servant, they are her head clerks : he is in the closet, they stand in the hall without.

To some readers these may appear to be mere subtleties. They certainly escaped eyes of great acuteness, when those of the Prince Consort and of Baron Stockmar passed over them. But every trade has its secrets. The baker and the brewer, the carpenter and the mason, all the fraternity of handicraft and production, have, where they understand their business, certain nice *minutiæ* of action neither intelligible to nor seen by the observer from without, but upon which niceties the whole efficiency of their work, and the just balances of its parts, depend. There is nowhere a more subtle machinery than that of the British Cabinet. It has no laws. It has no

records. Of the few who pass within the magic circle, and belong to it, many never examine the mechanism which they help to work. Only the most vague conceptions respecting its structure and operations are afloat in the public mind. These things may be pretty safely asserted: that it is not a thing made to order, but a growth; and that no subject of equal importance has been so little studied. We need not wonder if even to the most intelligent foreigner, who gets it up as a lesson from a school-book, it is an unsolved riddle; we may be thankful that the mistaken reasonings of Baron Stockmar never baffled his good sense in practical advice, and that his balloon, even after careering wildly in the fields of air, always managed, when alighting on the earth, to find its way home.

We will now turn to another chapter, where Mr. Martin deals with the Papal Aggression, and with the thoughts which the controversy at that time stirred in the mind of the Prince. He went to work, as his manner was, to 'analyse' (p. 341) the crisis, in its Anglican rather than in its Romeward aspect, with philosophical assiduity; and he laid down the principles which he conceived to indicate the true path towards a remedy.

The evil he conceived to be the introduction of Romish doctrines and practices by the Clergy against the will of their congregations, under the assumption of a sole authority. And the cure he found in three propositions, thus expressed (p. 343):

'That the Laity have an equal share of authority in the Church with the Clergy.

'That no alteration in the form of Divine Service shall therefore be made without the formal consent of the Laity.

'Nor any interpretation given of Articles of Faith without their concurrence.'

From these, he thought, would spring a 'whole living Church constitution,' in government and doctrine.

Of these propositions we put aside the first, not only because it is expressed without historical or theological precision, but also and mainly because it is an abstraction. Nor need we dwell upon the third, because, after another quarter of a century's experience, it has not been thought necessary either by Laity or Clergy to call for any new interpretation of Articles of Faith. But the second touches a matter which has invited legislative handling—namely, 'the form of Divine Service.' And the readers of Mr. Martin will at once be struck with the glaring fact, that the basis for legislation,

which was suggested by the Prince, is totally different from that which was accepted by Parliament on the recommendation of the Archbishops and the Earl of Beaconsfield. Nor is the difference of a speculative character; the lines, on which the two work out their results, are lines which cut across one another. In making good this proposition, we shall assume, of course—but it is a very large and generous assumption—that the Act will be both impartially and learnedly worked by the tribunals. So regarding it, we observe that the very rule which the Prince sets up, the Archbishops and the Prime Minister have induced Parliament to trample under foot. The rule of the Prince is that existing practice is so far to be presumed right practice, that it shall not be altered without consent of Laity and Clergy. The basis of the Act is that existing practice, however established by length of time, and however acceptable both to Laity and Clergy, may at any time be challenged by three parishioners, who may never have even seen the inside of the church as worshippers, and, unless the will of the Bishop intercept the process, is to be overset if it be inconsistent with the judicial, that is the literal, meaning of the words of a statute passed in 1661. Further, it is now the presumable duty of the Clergy of themselves to alter their practice, even against their own inclinations and those of the congregation, where it is not in conformity with the exact prescriptions of that statute in any one of the myriad details which it prescribes. It is true that, where a trial is demanded, the Bishop may stop it. We do not doubt that this power, without which the Act would have been even far worse than it is, will be rationally and prudently exercised by nearly all the Bishops. But the difficulty of so using it will, to the most honest and enlightened mind, be very great: in one or two instances, which it would be invidious to name, we can hardly hope that it will be considerably employed; and if but one Bishop out of twenty-eight or thirty be suitable to their purpose, the wire-pullers at the centre will put up in that diocese their three puppet-parishioners, and seek so to rule the whole country. The whole spirit and tendency of the Act go to narrow discretion; to curtail freedom enjoyed for generations with satisfaction to all; and to tighten practice according to a rule adopted more than two centuries ago, and to such interpretations of that rule as may be pronounced by judges, nearly the whole of whom are not only ignorant of ecclesiastical history and law, but apparently as unaware as babes that such ignorance is either a disqualification or even a disadvan-

tage for the exercise of their office. But this tendency and spirit of the Act is and has been felt to be so intolerable, that it has been qualified by the interpolation of an arbitrary power, which may extinguish the Act in Diocese A, give it absolute and unrestricted sway in Diocese B, and a mode of operation adjusted to as many points between these extremes in Dioceses from C to Z. Now the Prince's plan, not denying the authority of the law, nor impeding its ultimate enforcement, introduced collaterally into our system a new sanction—namely, a sanction for things established by usage. They were not to be altered without consent of Laity and Clergy. This was his simple plan of change. Where that consent was obtained, and the desire for a change established, still they could only be altered in the direction of conformity with the law, which remained applicable in all its rigour, and without any spurious triad of parishioners or any intervention of an arbitrary *veto*, to unestablished novelties. We have surely here a very notable competition between the plans of the Archbishops and of the Prince.

‘Look here upon this picture—and on this.’

The Prince was ever regarded with some jealousy and apprehension by Churchmen : yet some of them may be tempted to wish not only that his most valuable life had been largely prolonged, but that he had been Primate of all England in 1874. We should not then have been trembling at this time in fearful anxiety to learn whether a great and historic Church, rich in work and blessing, rich in traditions, and richer still in promise, is or is not to be the victim of the follies committed in 1874.<sup>1</sup>

It was to be expected that one, whose life was so steadily

<sup>1</sup> It is needful to correct an error into which Mr. Martin has fallen, not unnaturally, in a matter lying beside the main scope of his task. He says in p. 338 that after the Papal Brief ‘the country was put upon the alert, and the progress of proselytism stayed.’ Chronologically, this is not so. It was shortly after the Papal Brief that the great rush of secessions took place. Then it was that Cardinal Manning carried into the Roman Church those peculiar and very remarkable powers of government, to which she at least has not refused a sphere. Then departed from us Mr. James Hope, Q.C., who may with little exaggeration be called the flower of his generation. With and after them a host of others. It was eminently the time of secessions. It may be difficult to say whether the Papal Brief seriously acted one way or the other. For it was very closely followed by the judgment in the Gorham case, and this may in all likelihood have been the principal cause of a blast which swept away, to their own great detriment as well as ours, a large portion of our most learned, select, and devoted clergy.

held under the control of conscience, should deeply feel the responsibilities attending the education of the Royal children. In no station of life is there such a command, or such a free application, of all the appliances of instruction. The obstacles, which it places in the way of profound and solid learning, are indeed insurmountable. This disability is perhaps compensated by the tendency of the station itself to confer a large amount of general information, and of social training. Our young Princes and Princesses have grown up under a sense of social responsibility, far heavier than that which is felt by, or impressed upon, children born and reared at the degree of elevation next to theirs. In a religious point of view, however, their dangers are immense: and they are greatly aggravated by the fact that, after the earliest periods of life are passed, and anything like manhood is attained, they do not enjoy the benefit of that invaluable check upon thought and conduct, which is afforded by the free communication and mutual correction of equals. They have no equals: the cases, in which a friend can be strong enough and bold enough to tell them the whole truth about themselves, are of necessity exceptional. It is much if the air of courts be not tainted with actual falsehood. The free circulation of truth it hardly can permit: and the central personages in them are hereby deprived in a great degree of one of the readiest and most effective helps for their salvation, while they are set up as a mark to attract all the wiles of the designing and the vile.

It is well known, to the infinite honour of Her Majesty and of the Prince, how, especially in the conspicuous instances of the Dowager Lady Lyttelton and of the excellent Dean of Windsor, the best provision, which love and wisdom could suggest, was made for the religious training of the Royal offspring. In this department, as well as in others, the Prince looked for a principle, and a defined scope. As early as March 1842 (p. 175), the inevitable Baron had supplied a Memorandum on the subject. He reverted to it in July 1846 (p. 183), and laid it down that it could not be too soon to settle in what principles the Prince of Wales should be brought up. He deprecated the frame of mind, which leads to indiscriminate conservatism; desired freedom of thought, and a reflective appreciation of practical morality as indispensable to the relation between sovereign and people. And then he proceeded to the question of religion. The law required that 'the belief of the Church of England shall be the faith of the members of the Royal Family' (p. 185); and this law must be obeyed. But should not the young Prince's mind

in due time be opened to changes in progress, and to the probable effect of discoveries in science? Society, says the Baron, is already divided into two classes. The first is composed of those, who hope for improvement from increased knowledge of nature, and attention to the laws of our being; which will work out the results intended by the Creator. Of the hierophants of this class the Baron, while he favours them, has not hesitated to write thus: 'a constant war is carried on openly, *but more generally from masked batteries*, by this class of persons, on the prevailing religious opinions' (p. 186). 'The class contains the seeds of important modifications in the opinions and religious institutions of the British Empire.'

Then we have the second class, whom the Baron succinctly describes as 'the advocates of supernatural religion.' This is frank enough: and no attempt is made to disguise the fact, that the issue raised was between Christianity and Theism. The account given of this class is given *ab extra*, and not as in the other case from within the precinct. It is, accordingly, as might have been expected, fundamentally inaccurate and misleading. 'The orthodox believers regard the supernatural portions of Christianity as the basis which sustains its morality, and as the sole foundations of government, law, and subordination.' Of misrepresentation Baron Stockmar was incapable; but we have here a strange amount of ignorance. He might as well have said that supernaturalists were men who did not eat or drink, and who held that corporal life was only to be sustained by Divine grace, which was the sole foundation of running and jumping. A man who lives in the second story of a house rests only, it seems, upon the air, and not upon the first story and the basement. But, in truth, the Christian morality enjoys all the supports which belong to the morality of Stockmar, while it is lifted by the Incarnation to a higher level, with a larger view, and a place nearer to God. We could not expect him to have wasted his time in reading the works of theologians, which, however, he thought himself qualified to describe. Yet he ought surely to have known that S. Paul expressly deduces the binding character of religion (Rom. i. 19, 20) from the book of Nature, and also regards offences against Nature as a distinct and deeper category of sin (*ibid.* 26, 27). Nor would it have been unworthy of him to bear in mind that Dante has placed the violent against Nature in a deeper condemnation even than those who are violent against God (*Inferno*, canto xiv. and xv.). The Baron must have been a good deal puzzled to reconcile his own unequivocal condemnation of supernatural religion with his frank



recognition of a legal necessity for training in the Anglican system of belief. Upon the whole, we must say, even with the gratitude every Englishman should feel towards this faithful friend and adviser of his Sovereign, the Memorandum, as it is presented by Mr. Martin, has too much the appearance of one of the 'masked batteries' which it describes. But parental wisdom was not to be seduced even by this great authority, and the arrangements for the education of the Prince of Wales were made, we believe, in the old Christian fashion.

It is not, however, as a model either of theological or of political opinion that any human being can profitably be proposed for exact imitation, or that we think the Prince will be longest and best remembered among us. In the speculative man there remained much more of the German, than in the practical. His contemplation and study of the living and working England were alike assiduous and fruitful; and this man, who never sat upon our Throne, and who ceased at the early age of forty-two to stand beside it, did more than any of our Sovereigns, except very, very few, to brighten its lustre and strengthen its foundations. He did this, by the exhibition in the highest place, jointly with the Queen, of a noble and lofty life, which refused to take self for the centre of its action, and sought its pleasure in the unceasing performance of duty. There has been, beyond all doubt, one perceptible and painful change since his death: a depression of the standard of conduct within the very highest circle of society. In proof of this melancholy proposition, we will specify that branch of morality, which may fairly be taken as a testing-branch—namely, conjugal morality. Among the causes of an incipient change so disastrous to our future prospects, we should be inclined to reckon the death of the Prince Consort, and the disappearance from public view of that majestic and imposing, as well as attractive and instructive, picture of a Court which, while he lived, was always before the eyes of the aristocracy and the nation.

Neither this book, nor any book written from a peculiar point of view, can ever supply a standard history of the period it embraces. It may, nevertheless, supply—and we think it has thus far supplied—a valuable contribution to, and an indispensable part of, such a history. This alone more than justifies the publication. But it has a yet higher title in its faithful care and solid merit as a biography. From the midst of the hottest glow of worldly splendour it has drawn forth to public contemplation a genuine piece of solid, sterling, and



unworldly excellence ; a pure and lofty life, from which every man, and most of all, every Christian, may learn many an ennobling lesson ; on which he may do well to meditate when he communes with his own heart, in his chamber, and is still.

---

ART. IX.—MODERN DISSENT : THE LIBERATION  
SOCIETY: THE BURIALS BILL.

*Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage  
and Control. Report for 1876.*

FEW statements are more incessantly repeated than that the greatest of all the alterations which have taken place during the past half-century of ceaseless change is that which is patent in the condition and working of the Church of England. The statement is usually made with a twofold reference. It applies, and it is understood to apply, at once to the public action and energy of the Church at large, and likewise to the personal character and devotion of her clergy. It ought in our judgment to be applied with at least an equal emphasis to vast uprising of a lay liberality alike in respect of money and of time devoted freely to sacred uses by countless individuals in every walk of life. We do not forget the *fortes ante Agamemnona* ; we are neither so ignorant as to be unconscious, or so ungenerous as to be unmindful, of the great names of the past century and of the earlier years of this ; but cases which were rare and exceptional seventy or eighty years ago are now happily so frequent as scarcely to call for individual mention. At all events, it would no longer be the most natural thing in the world for a rising young manufacturer to be advised to give up Dissent and profess himself a Churchman on the ground that in the Church there was no one who would call upon him for money, whereas if he remained a Dissenter his increasing means would make it impossible to escape liberal contributions to 'his chapel' without losing caste among his co-religionists. After all allowances are made, the facts bear out the popular remark ; few changes have been greater than those in the Church of England, whether you regard it in its collective aspect, or with respect

to the personal character of its clergy, or with respect to the zeal and devotion of its more active laymen.

There is another alteration, however, which in our judgment is at least equally remarkable, but which does not yet seem to have attracted corresponding attention, although it is one which runs parallel with the foregoing. The alteration to which we refer is the changed character of English Nonconformity and its marvellously altered attitude towards the Church herself. Time was—there are plenty of men now living who can well remember it—when, however mistaken we may consider them, it was the search after a more earnest type of religion and a closer religious fellowship which carried men into Dissenting communities, and when all their effort was to render their own system as complete in its apparatus and its appliances as their means would permit. Those were not the days of æsthetics, and the quaint red brick Bethels and Ebnenezers of seventy years ago are not models of beauty, but if not lovely they were at least beloved by those who worshipped in them after the manner of their sect. The tourist, wandering in old-fashioned quarters of country towns, more especially in Yorkshire or the Midlands, will come upon them now and then, stern square blocks of solid building, and usually—we speak of what we knew,—each with its surrounding burial-ground, somewhat grim to our modern eyes, but there was a cared-for trimness as well as grimness, which enforced respect for those who thus looked to rest in death hard by the fabric where they had worshipped during life. The truth is, that there was heart in the system of these elder Nonconformists, and all their effort was to make each central hearth of their religious system as homelike as they could, as complete as they could, and then to draw together there and be content.

We have not yet exhausted the notes and marks of by-gone Nonconformity. There is a word in every politician's mouth which, according to its application, is of good or evil savour. That word is '*non-intervention*.' Now, whatever may be said of the spirit which leads to the love of intervention, there can be no doubt at all as to that which most surely leads to *non-intervention*; and that is the being content at home. When the home affections are strong and are kept in play by objects on whom to rest, when we are surrounded by those we love and trust and in whose affection and esteem we find our happiness, then there is little tendency to concern ourselves with things beyond our borders. It is true of states; it is true of families; it is true of communities. After all, man is

a creature of limited capacities, and where there are near objects which make full demand on all his powers and affections, it has a wonderfully pacifying effect upon all his external relations. The full heart is at peace with itself. It is at peace also with its neighbour. It has a tendency to see only those things which make for peace. Full, itself, of the kindlinesses of life, it creates its own atmosphere round itself, and it sees things coloured through the medium of its own characteristics. Its aggressions, if any, are only the aggressions of kindness and good-will.

It is on this principle—the principle, namely, of the internal contentment resulting from heart and feeling being fully occupied with the discharge of mutual duty,—it is on this principle that we understand the marked non-aggressiveness of the Nonconformists of sixty years ago. Contented at home, all they wanted was to be let alone. With the fire of a real religion—whatever their technical theology may have been—warm at their hearts, and kept warm by a very active mutual charity towards the members of their own societies,<sup>1</sup> all they wanted was to be left at peace to follow their own ways. Hence, also, came the readiness to see good in others, and thus, while stout enough in their Nonconformity, and narrow enough as they often were alike in views and culture, that peculiar quality so happily nicknamed a few years ago, by a Dissenter of the modern type, ‘the dissidence of dissent,’ was in those days quite in the background. With regard to members of the Wesleyan Society, all this is too well known to require remark. To ‘supplement not supplant’ the operations of the Church was the very *raison d’être* of all Wesley’s undertakings. But there may be many to whom it may be new to read passages, such as the following, which we quote from one well known in his day as a leader among Dissenters, Mr. Angell James. And let it not be thought that they are in any way exceptional utterances. They are genuinely representative, and they go to illustrate our special point, which is that, when men or a society of men have their affections engaged in a religious work (whether on a right plan or otherwise is not here the question), they have an eye for whatever religious work or motive exists in other people, and being engrossed by this, have the less room in their hearts for bitter-

<sup>1</sup> It is strictly true that at the time we speak of Dissent was specially active in all that we now understand by parochial ministrations among the poor. The Hegira of Dissenting Chapels from the poor to the well-to-do middle-class districts of our towns is of modern date. Of course such ministrations were among their own ‘members.’

ness, suspicion, or misrepresentation. The passages are as follow :—

‘The Scriptural doctrines of the Church of England are those by which the Reformers assailed the Papacy, and effected the Reformation. Its divines have covered its altars with works more precious than the finest gold of the ancient sanctuary of Israel. Its literature is the boast and glory of the civilised world. Its armoury is filled with weapons of ethereal temper, which its hosts have wielded, and with the spoils that they have won in the conflict with heresy, infidelity, and Popery. Its martyrology is emblazoned with names that are dear and sacred to the heart of every Protestant. And at this moment are heard from many thousands of her pulpits sounds accompanied by the life-giving power of the quickening spirit, while the dead in trespasses and sins are starting into life, and made willing in the day of God’s power, which shall be as the dew of the morning.’<sup>1</sup>

‘Can we see the whole Church establishment, from the Archbishop of Canterbury down to the curate of the smallest village, with all their modern and comprehensive agency of Societies and District visiting, and other means of influence and power in busy motion, dotting the land all over with churches and schools ; and thus by all these efforts labouring so entirely to occupy the nation, as to leave no room for, and to prove there is no need of, any other body of Christians ;—can we see this constantly before our eyes and not see our need of an earnest ministry?’<sup>2</sup>

And here let us observe the comprehensiveness of these two testimonies. The former bears witness at once to the historic services rendered to the cause of religion by the Church of England, and also to the visible present work of the Holy Ghost carried on through her ministrations. The latter appeals to her exterior parochial and educational activities as a reason—for what?—for supplanting her?—for crushing her out of existence? Just the contrary. Mr. Angell James uses these patent facts as the foundation of an appeal to his own community, *not to be outdone* in earnestness, not to be outstripped in the race of devotion and of good works. It is not hostile intervention, but honourable emulation which reigned in the mind of him who penned these lines. Time has changed all that. How do things stand now? Let us see.

But here, before we proceed to the contrasted picture, let us state, once and for all, that we would not for a moment deny that there are many in whom at the present day the spirit of Mr. Angell James is still surviving. We would

<sup>1</sup> *Dissent and the Church of England*, pp. 111, 112.

<sup>2</sup> *Earnest Ministry*, pp. 192, 193.

deny nothing of the kind. But that which we do observe with such keen regret is, that so far as the public utterances and the public action of the Nonconformist bodies are concerned, the change is total. There may be, nay, there certainly are, thousands of quiet folk from whose minds all bitterness and misrepresentation are altogether alien. But what we are concerned with is the public overt action of communities as such, and what we say is that, great as may be the change in the Church of England during the present century, the change in the character and attitude of Nonconformity is greater still.

We spoke, a few paragraphs back, of the earlier phase of Dissent, one not beyond the memory of living men, when after its lights it genuinely sought out the waste places of the land and ministered diligently to the ignorant and the poor. Does it do so now? Let Dr. Hume's (of Liverpool) statistics as to the way in which Dissenting chapels have *migrated* from the poorer to the richer quarters of our great towns give the answer. Go into Bethnal Green and see how, there, it is the Church and her clergy, grievously hampered by poverty, no doubt, that are striving to keep the lamp of religion burning among the destitute and the suffering. Nonconformists have grown rich and wealthy. There is ample *esprit de corps* among them. They can spend their money lavishly to advance their 'cause.' But if you see a sacred building rising in some degraded quarter of a town, you may be sure it is a church and not a conventicle. Speaking generally, the zeal for souls has given place to the zeal for their society or connexion. *Pari passu* with all this comes a totally altered attitude towards the Church. It is only natural that it should be so. So long as their own religious life or work, and what they considered the good of souls and the spread of God's truth, was their main consideration, so long of course it was a secondary consideration by whom the work was done, and the higher spirits among them could look at the work and exertions of the Church in the temper of those quotations from Mr. Angell James. The change comes when the advancement of the society or institution assumes the leading place in their regard. Then every successful enterprise of the Church is viewed only as so much deducted from their own *prestige*; then whatever ground is occupied by the Church becomes a Naboth's vineyard, the very existence of which is a grief of heart: then, not honourable emulation, but a deepening jealousy takes possession of them, and when jealousy is master, then farewell to all honesty or fairness of judgment, farewell to all generosity of sentiment, farewell to all possi-

bility of seeing things as they really are. There is a sort of moral anachronism in finding fault with the jealous man for his distorted misstatements. The fault lies further back. It lies in the antecedent jealousy, not in the consequent false representations. He *cannot* see things without distortion, and that which you ought to fasten upon for rebuke and reproof is the inward sin of jealousy, rather than the outward fault of misrepresentation. And what is true of individuals is, we believe, even truer still of institutions or societies. Men idealise a society to which they belong, and that which conscience would brand at once as selfishness and sin if done for themselves as individuals, fails altogether to shock their moral sense when done as an offering to a 'cause.' There is an overmastering intensity about all class feelings, class hatreds, class emulations, and class jealousies, which, however well known to the observant, seems never yet to have received that scientific attention at the hands of moralists which it deserves. Perhaps the grandest illustration of it was offered during the first French Revolution, when men who had all their lives received nothing but justice and kindness at the hands of their own individual *seigneur* could yet feel bound to join in his ruin and destruction, merely because he was a member of the *class* with which their own class was at feud. The antagonism of Nonconformity to the Church is fast assuming this character. If any one doubts it, let us ask him how else he is to explain the savage ferocity of misstatement with which Mr. John Bright, whose character in all personal and private relations is one of kindly geniality, assailed the whole body of the rural clergy during the education debate of 1876.

Of course we shall be told that in saying all this we are fomenting strife. We totally deny it. We write without bitterness. We desire to deal not so much with phenomena as with the inner disease of which those phenomena are the symptoms and the outcome. We believe largely in the unconsciousness of numbers, of those whose words and actions we are speaking of and shall go on to speak of. It is of the very nature of the class jealousies we speak of to blind men to the real facts, and to delude their mental vision with supposititious facts, and then goad them to madness by the imagined spectacle. Bitterness is not the feeling with which we regard such cases. It is not bitterness, but the sense of an evil which has to be encountered. It is not bitterness, but the perception that we are placed in circumstances which necessitate precaution, and the further perception also that

our precautions must be suited to the *nature* of the special danger we have to meet. In politics, as in medicine, you *may* fail to save your patient even though you use the right remedies ; but what chance have you if, mistaking the nature of the ailment, you treat it as if it were one of mere irritation, instead of a deeply-seated inflammation ?

It is absolutely necessary, therefore, and not merely in any spirit of censoriousness, that we should make it extremely clear that in the case before us we have to deal, not with a reasonable party or section of the community, who, suffering from removable grievances, are agitating reasonably for their mitigation or removal, but with men whose words and actions show them to be animated by a spirit which no conciliation can conciliate or concession pacify, and whose object is not so much to improve their own position as to damage some one else's. It is *delenda est Carthago* now. It is dis-establishment that is the one idea of contemporary Dissent, and all else is regarded solely with reference to its hindering or forwarding this one end and object.

We do not believe that any Dissenter will deny what we have just written, or that in the Liberation Society and its operations we have before us at once the quintessence and the expression of existing Nonconformity. If you want to understand the drift of any Dissenting movement or operation, you must take up your position at the Liberation Society's standpoint, and then you will see things in their organic connexion and in their true perspective. The Liberation Society's office is to all the public movements of Dissent what Moltke's cabinet was during the Prusso-Austrian war. You do not know what any operation really means unless you look at it from its true centre. Deal with it as an isolated movement and you are sure to be mistaken. It is on this principle that, though we have to speak regarding the Burials Bill, we have harked back such a long way, and striven to justify our view by so laborious an induction.

Now the natural instinct of every Englishman, we might say of every honest man—let alone a Churchman or a Christian—the natural instinct of every Englishman and every gentleman, is that whenever any individual or group of individuals comes before him with the tale of any supposed wrong or grievance, he should, in the first instance, cast about to see if that grievance is capable of removal. It is only when circumstances lead him to inquire further, that he begins to ask whether the grievance be real or factitious, whether its removal would content the complainants, whether



it may not be part and parcel of a prearranged course of organised encroachment. It is in the operations of the Liberation Society at the existing moment, combined with the past history of similar complaints, that we find what not merely puts us on our guard, but renders it something very like treason to our own cause *not* to be most keenly alive to the unsatisfactory aspects of the case.

The Disestablishment of the Irish Church was an immense encouragement to our English Nonconformists. It was supported on the express ground that by whatever arguments it was advocated, these arguments had no bearing on the totally different case of the English Church, so that English M.P.'s might vote for it without fear of being considered inconsistent in resisting the like measure being meted out to them at home. The measure once passed, the plea was scattered to the winds immediately, and since then the only cry of our English Dissenters has been that the Irish Church has been too tenderly handled, that the turn of the English Church must come next, and that when it comes we must not look for anything like the favourable terms which our *too* lucky Irish sister was so fortunate as to obtain! Meantime, what is the Liberation Society doing? A new Parliament succeeds that which overthrew the Irish Establishment, and it is one in which the Nonconformists are nowhere. But our franchise is now of the most democratic kind. Constituencies, such as ours now are, are proverbially fickle, and the masses are always ready to believe anything laid to the charge of their superiors and of existing institutions. The Dissenters, therefore, regard their case as one of only temporary postponement, and, as they cannot look for anything from the present Parliament, they turn all their attention towards securing a favourable turn of things at the next election. Hence the Liberation Society constitutes itself a great teaching association to educate up the English voters to return a Parliament to disestablish the English Church. They map out the country into forty districts, with a paid agent in each, with whom the central committee is in correspondence, and whose local knowledge they utilise. Two practised speakers, Mr. R. W. Dale and Mr. Rogers, have placed their services at the disposal of the Society, and during the past year no fewer than *one thousand* meetings have been held, while as many as *two and a half millions* of disestablishment publications have been circulated. Their plan is to saturate the country, more especially the lower orders, with their views; and to this end they employ every kind of agency, meetings, books and

pamphlets, placards and meetings—nothing comes amiss to them. If a 'Mission' is going on in any neighbourhood or parish, so that the Church and its work are for the moment exceptionally prominent before the minds of men, the opportunity is seized to placard the walls with their statements, and to circulate their tracts and leaflets. During the Plymouth Congress, those of us who had to pass through the inferior streets in the neighbourhood of the Guildhall, found walls and windows furnished plentifully with bills and placards such as we describe. In the manufacturing districts agents are secured among the artisans, and factories and workshops are plied with their papers. Nothing is left undone to win over, or to prejudice, the ignorant or the indifferent. Everything is done to raise an anti-clerical storm against the next ensuing general election.

'A staff of nearly forty persons,' we are quoting from the Report for 1876, 'is so located as to include every part of the kingdom, and to form a network of agencies, available for local purposes, while acting under the guidance of the central organisation. The local knowledge, and the zeal of the agents, have enabled the Society to reach places and persons untouched by previous operations. The agitation has been not only extended, but more persistently maintained, and many of the local organisations have acted with greatly increased vigour . . . and on the occurrence of any event which may call for unusual exertion,<sup>1</sup> the Society's influence will be promptly and decisively exercised.'

The number of public meetings and lectures during the last year was no fewer than *one thousand* as against *seven* hundred during the previous year, and these have included—

'Every county in England save one; and while very few large towns have been omitted, the number of small places and rural parishes visited by the Society's representatives has never been so great. Such an amount of *educational work* would have been impossible without the co-operation of a body of lecturers and speakers, of whose ability and earnestness, combined with prudence and readiness of resource, the Society may be justly proud. Among these may be named two gentlemen whose assistance has laid the Committee and their constituents under special obligation. When, prior to the commencement of last season, Mr. Dale and Mr. Rogers offered to deliver a series of addresses in the largest towns of the kingdom, they not only undertook a great responsibility, but expressly stipulated that their services should be rendered without remuneration. Their offer was accepted with confidence, as well as with gratitude, and that confidence has been fully justified by

<sup>1</sup> The italics in these quotations are ours.

the result. The meetings held at Bradford, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Derby, Bristol, Plymouth, Norwich, and London, were highly successful—in regard to numbers, to enthusiasm, and to the impression which they produced. The plan pursued by the speakers had the advantages of method and completeness; while their addresses were characterised by persuasiveness and dignity, as well as by oratorical power. They were fully reported by the local newspaper press; and reprints of the reports were circulated by thousands in every part of the kingdom.

And each form of activity dovetails in with the other—

‘Increased activity in the use of the platform has necessitated, as well as facilitated, increased activity in the use of the press. For every meeting, or lecture, creates a demand for further information, and brings new readers within the reach of the Society’s influence. The Committee have also fulfilled their intention of freely distributing tracts and other publications in villages as well as in towns, and in this they have received valuable aid from a large body of volunteers, *as well as from those who have been remunerated for a house to house distribution*. Last year, the summer months—when meetings cannot be held with advantage—were utilised by a systematic display, in nearly every watering-place in England and Wales, of *carefully prepared placards*; which were thus brought under the eye of thousands of readers. As a further means of carrying their literature into new circles, the Committee have lately inserted suitable matter in the *advertising columns of journals which circulate largely among the working classes*, and with evidently favourable results. The largest amount of printed matter ever sent out from the Society’s dépôt has been issued during the past year—the total number of publications being above 2,500,000 copies. Nor is it likely that the maximum has yet been reached,’ &c. &c.

Of course all this cannot be done without money; but of money for purposes such as these there would seem to be no lack. A reserve of 100,000*l.*, an annual income of 15,600*l.* will pay for a good deal of ‘agency’ as well as of printing and lecturing. Besides all which, the Liberation Society has drawn ‘Agricultural Labourers Union’ into concert with it, so that the Union lecturers and orators are now anti-Church lecturers as well. How heartily the two co-operate our readers may judge from the following passage of a speech of Mr. Arch’s, at Honeybourne in June of last year, reported in *The English Labourer* :—

‘As to setting pastor and flock at variance, if it did not cause any breach between themselves and their God, he did not care how much it divorced them from a set of money-mongering, humbugging parsons. The village parsons, as a rule, had been the *most unmitigated evils to the country*, and they had wofully neglected the education of the

labourers' children, and only took this matter and that of Sunday Schools in hand when Dissent crept into their parishes.'

It is certainly high time that it should be generally known in what sort of spirit, the 'great educational work' spoken of in our foregoing extract is being carried on; but lest any one should say that it is unfair to judge of the political Dissenters generally by the coarse language of such an ally as Mr. Arch, we would ask our readers to say if there is much to choose between Mr. Arch and Dr. Aveling, the Independent minister. Here is an extract from his opening address at the annual meeting only last autumn of the Congregational Union:—

'The Irish Church Establishment fell down, like Ananias, before the tribunal of Truth and Justice, and gave up the ghost, and was borne to its burial. We warn those who refuse to accede to our righteous requirements, that they may expect soon to hear the ominous words, "Behold the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out." (Laughter and applause.)'

Observe that these are not the words of a vulgar labourer, speaking at a low mass-meeting, but those of a 'minister of religion,' and one of distinction too, and uttered at the solemn annual gathering of his sect. Of what kind of condemnation should we think ourselves worthy were such language to be held in our Convocation, or at any Church Congress or Conference? One more specimen only, and this time it shall be from the newspaper which represents the Baptist sect; speaking of the 'increase of the episcopate,' it writes:—

'Surely the proposed "increase of deception" will arouse every thinking Englishman to protest against it. The present amount of "Established deception" is unbearable. See what the State Churches have done all over the world. See what Popery is as an Establishment; Mohammedanism the same: at the present moment and in times past have caused more bloodshed than Kings and Emperors (*sic*); and look at home at our Establishment, the manufactory of hypocrites and the school for Popery.'

Enough of these unpleasant specimens, which, to our sorrow, we could multiply indefinitely. For their introduction at this stage of our argument we make no apology whatever, since, if there be one thing more incumbent on us than another, it is to cast a little light into the seething mass of hostility which surrounds us, and to let Church people see a little of that with which it is our own most unpleasant duty to acquaint ourselves. An army which should be unprovided with scouts to bring in tidings of hostile movements may be surprised and defeated before it knows what has

happened; and at the present moment such a warning as this is only too necessary for the Church of England. When leading 'ministers' can speak in such a tone as this, when the leading organ of a great sect like that of the Baptists can write like this, when the Liberation Society employs the agency of such Bashi-Bazouks as Mr. Arch shows himself in the specimen we have above quoted, it is surely high time that Churchmen should be acquainted with the spirit in which all that they hold dear is being systematically assailed. We say nothing as to the *falsehood* of such assertions as that of Mr. Arch respecting the neglect, or worse, of the clergy in the matter of education, for there, alas! he has only too much excuse in the example of those who enlist his services, and it is quite conceivable that in his ignorance he may fancy himself not so far from the truth. But it is hard to understand how educated men, like those who direct the movements of the Liberation Society, can commit themselves to such propositions as those which they are day by day maintaining in the face of the audiences whom they seek to 'educate:' statements, we mean, such as this, that 'the Established Church was created by Act of Parliament,' when they know that no such Act ever existed. Charters in ancient days, and Acts of Parliament in more modern times, *recognise* and *assume* its existence, but, as to 'establishing' or 'creating' it, the thing would be too absurd were it not that incessant reiteration will make anything believed by those who have neither the opportunity nor the disposition to learn for themselves. So, again, with the allegation that 'the clergy are State-paid,' that 'tithe is a tax'—propositions which are firmly believed by tens of thousands of the 'working men,' on whose votes at the next election the Liberation Society is now counting with such glee. While as to the matter of education, while the Church has been doing *voluntarily*, and that largely at the cost of clerical toil and money, not less than 82 per cent. of the education of the country, 'the Working Men's General Political Vigilance Committee' could write in view of the late London School Board Election that—

'The clerical party in the present contest are appealing to the meanest passions in the human mind, and endeavouring to incite the people against one of the most glorious and hopeful movements of modern times—a sound and practical education for all children, be they rich or poor.'

We quote from the address of Committee published in the *English Independent* of November 16, 1876. Equally

wide of the mark are the doctrines which are promulgated respecting the property of the Church and the *status* of the clergy. We have had occasion to mention more than once Mr. R. W. Dale, the Independent minister, whose lecturing is so warmly acknowledged in one of our quotations from the Liberation Society's Report. Now, Mr. Dale is the editor of the *Congregationalist*, a Magazine in which, not long back, there appeared an article headed 'Parish Churches: To whom do they Belong?' in which the writer lays it down that the clergyman being 'the servant of the parish'—

'If the parish is permitted to relieve him from his duties, and if the parish determines to do it, the salary—after providing for any "vested interest"—reverts to the parish as a matter of course.'

So much for the clergyman. Now for the church. To whom does it belong? To those who built it? Oh dear, no. Undoubtedly to the parishioners:—

'Unitarians, Baptists, Independents have as good a right to speak there as the soundest Churchman. The Church is theirs; it was erected for their use; it cannot be taken down without their permission. The new Church, built in place of the old one, is also theirs, *whoever may have found the money for building it.*'

All this makes one rub one's eyes, and ask if one is wide awake, or if the words are written in earnest. It is not yet ten years since the Dissenting argument was that they had *no* interest in the parish church, and it was on this plea that they sought and obtained immunity from church rates. Now the change of front is as total as in a transformation scene of a Christmas pantomime. But the closing paragraph of the article is even more amazingly ingenious in the argumentative audacity of its way of putting things. Mr. Dale is not unaware of all that has been said of the vast sums spent by the present generation on church building and restoration, and this is how he meets it:—

'A section of the parishioners were content to celebrate worship according to the rules of the Book of Common Prayer, *and they have been permitted for a time* to have the exclusive use of a building which was intended for the use of their neighbours as well as themselves. What can be more reasonable than that, while this privilege is granted them, they should be required to keep the building in repair? As was suggested the other day at Derby, this principle explains the restoration, not only of parish churches, but of ancient cathedrals, which is going on all over the country. When property is held under a repairing lease, and the *lease is about expiring, the tenant is very busy in putting the premises in a tenantable condition*; and the universal



restoration of churches shows that our tenants not only recognise the obligation imposed upon them by law, but are resolved to discharge their obligation in a very handsome manner.'

'What can be more reasonable?' Yes indeed! But we should be disposed to ask, what can possibly be more convenient for a gentleman in difficulties as to an argument, than thus to imagine his history, to invent his law, to manufacture motives of action for other people, and then, mingling all the ingredients according to a fashion entirely his own, to elicit whatever result is consistent with his tastes or necessities? There is an originality which is almost superb in this idea of Mr. Dale's, that Church people of the nineteenth century have given their thousands and tens of thousands for the restoration of their churches and cathedrals as an outgoing tenant pays up his dilapidations, and have been actuated by the resolution to discharge this imaginary 'obligation in a very handsome manner!' On the contrary, we remember Professor J. J. Blunt, the then Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, towards the end of his course of 'Parish Priest' lectures, now nearly thirty years ago, touching for a moment upon the then rising interest in church restoration, and saying that the days might not be far distant when sectaries and schismatics might claim to use the fabrics of the Church for the promulgation of their alien tenets, and that he trusted those who restored them might do it in a fashion so symbolic of true teaching that should any other doctrine be uttered in them the very 'stone in the wall should cry out, and the beam out of the timber make answer to it' and utter its protest. Certainly Professor Blunt had something of prophetic lore. But only think of all this coming from a party which obtained the abolition of Church rates on the ground that none but Church people had any interest in the fabrics in question, and that, when once the vexatious impost was abolished, there would be nothing to disturb the peace between Church people and Nonconformists. Talk about educating the country in the principles of the Liberation Society; what more emphatic lessons could it be giving *us* as to its practice and its methods, and especially as to the worth of its professions and the value of concession? The abolition of Church rates was to inaugurate an era of peace. That was in 1868, and already in 1876 the situation is as we have described it! Surely, surely, Church people will *not* decline to learn the lesson so emphatically enforced.

When, therefore, we address ourselves at the opening of a new year to the particular question upon which during the



coming Session the battle will have to be fought between the political Dissenters and ourselves, it is only common-sense to ask, In what relation does this particular question stand to the larger and general controversy between the two contending parties? We have done our best to show the spirit in which, and the general aims with which, the active and political portion of Dissent is moving. It might, therefore, seem enough for us to dismiss the subject of the Burials Bill with the remark that it must be looked at not merely *per se* and as an isolated movement, but in its connexion with the broad general plan upon which the whole campaign of the Liberation Society is being conducted. We might do so, and we believe that we should be perfectly justified in doing so. We believe that, after all that we have now seen as to the avowed purposes and the manifested tactics of political Dissent, Church people would be fully justified in a course of simple and steadfast resistance to all further parley or even discussion on the subject of any so-called grievance or pretended claim. Years back, when it was the Roman Catholics who were agitating for the removal of disabilities, we were constantly warned that no reliance could be placed on the assurances of a body with whom it was a maxim that 'no faith was to be kept with heretics.' Is it not much the same now with these ultramontanes of Nonconformity? 'No faith to be kept with Churchmen.' Is it too much to say that these irreconcilables have not merely learned the lesson, but reduced its practice to something very like a science? Do not their tactics remind one of the case when the first Napoleon, otherwise despairing of success, sent forward a flag of truce in the midst of a battle, under cover of which to reconstitute his attack? 'No faith to be kept with Churchmen.' Yes, and not only so, but it seems that we are expected to be just as confiding, and to suspend our precautions as readily as ever, as if we had not been fired on from behind the flag of truce twenty times already. It is, however, only fair to say that our opponents do at last seem conscious that it is scarcely possible any longer to persuade us to look for any benefit from the old policy of concession. They argue the case, it is true. They still put forward their grievances *as* grievances, but while calling upon all bystanders to reprobate our conduct if *we* do not concede, they no longer pretend that the removal of the grievance will either content or pacify themselves. Argument and persuasion are still put forward for those who are still sufficiently untaught by experience to listen to them; but it is clear that those who use these persuasives do it with the full consciousness of their

hollowness. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, speaking of the Burials Bill and other matters, at the annual meeting of the Liberation Society last year,<sup>1</sup> says plainly that these are but minor matters, steps and steps only to a greater end, and that 'we,' *i.e.* the Liberation Society—

'must subordinate them to the greater issue which embraces all the rest, if we would rouse an amount and a character of enthusiasm which alone will bear us on to victory. *I think the time has come when we may fairly make such a declaration.*'

And at the same meeting, Dr. Landels said :

'Let me say finally, in spite of Government and in spite of clergy, we will carry our Burials Bill, which is the next thing we have in hand, and that done, *we shall be a step nearer the ultimate goal. There will not be much between us and the citadel then.* Having taken possession of all the outworks, the fortress will soon fall into our hands; for we do not conceal the fact that this is our final aim, and that we cannot rest satisfied until that aim is realised. Our clerical friends, in arguing against the Burials Bill, tell us, with refreshing simplicity, that if we get into the churchyards we will want to get into the churches next. What charming innocents they must be to put it thus! I think if by getting into the churches they mean that we shall demand to have national property employed for national purposes, and not reserved for the exclusive use of a sect, why then of course we mean to get into the churches. And, what is more, if our right to the churches be as good as our right to the churchyard, we will succeed in gaining what we demand.'

After this it might indeed seem superfluous to argue the question at all, but seeing that there is such a thing as an outside public to which the advocates of the Burials Bill still address themselves as though *they* were the injured innocents suffering wrong at the hands of an unfeeling and tyrannical hierarchy, it may not be superfluous once more to set in order the facts as they really stand in contrast with the representations of which we speak.

Their contention then is this,—that under existing circumstances there is no provision for a Nonconformist to be buried excepting in the burial-grounds of the Church, and that it is a 'grievance' that if a Nonconformist be so buried it must be by the ministration and with the service of the Church, and not by the ministration of the preacher of the sect to which he belongs.

On this the following questions arise :

I. First, is it the fact? And if so, of what dimensions is

<sup>1</sup> Held at Birmingham, May 3, 1876, Mr. Chamberlain in the chair.

the fact? *i.e.* to what extent is it true that Nonconformists are thus limited in their opportunities of sepulture?

II. Next, if true, is it a grievance? Is it the fact that Dissenters feel it to be one? Dissent has existed for generations, yet it is only a matter of yesterday that we have heard of this being a grievance.

III. And then, thirdly, if there be a grievance at all, is what the Liberation Society calls the abolition of 'the clerical monopoly in churchyards' (*see* Report for 1876, p. 12) the proper way to remove it? There are remedies *and* remedies. Some remedies have the bad habit of being worse than the disease.

First, then, is it the fact, and if so, to what extent? Here we are met by the striking fact that, with respect to by far the larger portion of the population, the people of England, whether Church people or Dissenters, do not depend for their opportunities of sepulture upon the Church's burial-grounds at all. Five-and-twenty years ago they did, but things have changed since then. Since the Act of 1852-3 no fewer than 1705 churchyards in the country and 208 around London have been practically closed,<sup>1</sup> *i.e.* there are nearly 2000 churchyards no longer available to the public. Neither Churchman nor Dissenter has any longer the opportunity of burial in them. They are on the same level. Now at first sight 2000 churchyards may not seem a very large proportion. But when you come to look at the amount of population which is thus deprived of the churchyard as a place of burial, the true significance of the case comes out. We may take the population of England and Wales at *twenty-two millions*. Now the population for which the means of burial is now provided under the Burials Act of 1852-3 is not less than *fourteen millions*. In other words, as regards *fourteen millions* out of *twenty-two*, it is simply NOT THE FACT that *anyone*, whether Churchman or Nonconformist, is dependent on the churchyards of the Church. Add to this that of course these *fourteen millions* are chiefly the dwellers in the towns, and it is in the towns chiefly that Dissent abounds, and the fact dwindles down to a very small fact indeed. Moreover, it is a fact which is diminishing every day, as more churchyards are closed, and more cemeteries opened under the existing Act.

But again, how stands the fact as regards the *eight millions* who remain—or rather as regards the very moderate propor-

<sup>1</sup> We say 'practically,' because in some cases of churchyards, otherwise closed, there are vaults belonging to particular families in which certain members of those families may be buried for years to come.

tion of the rural eight millions who may be other than Church people? *Are* they dependent upon the churchyards for burial? Certainly not. Taking the returns made to the House of Commons last spring, it appears that in 6,800 parishes there are 2,230 burial-grounds belonging to Nonconformists; in other words, the Dissenters have a burial-ground of their own, if they choose to use it, in one parish out of every three. Does any man in his senses suppose that in the rural districts there is anything like one-third of the population Dissenters? We shall be told of the case of Wales, which is mainly rural, and where there is a larger amount of rural Dissent than elsewhere. Well, then, so far back as 1873 Mr. Disraeli, now Lord Beaconsfield, could show that in the diocese of Llandaff returns from 132 parishes gave 238 chapels with 103 burial-grounds, the deficiency being supplied by eleven public cemeteries. In St. David's 165 parishes rejoice in 345 chapels with 209 burial-grounds, in addition to sixteen public cemeteries; so that Dissenters are positively more lavishly supplied than Churchmen. The *fact*, then, when looked into, dwindles down into a very small fact indeed. The truth is evidently this, that, in the old days, when there was, as we consider, more internal warmth about Dissenting systems, and when, in consequence, the centripetal forces of those were at their strongest, Dissenting congregations were as anxious to provide themselves with their own resting-places after decease, as with their own meeting-house during life, and though for the most part far from wealthy, they gladly did so. Their own mutual unity and mutual sympathy were enough for them: they did not need the stimulus derived from external antagonism. There is, accordingly, even though the present generation of Dissenters may be somewhat surprised to hear it, a very far from small supply of distinctively Dissenting burial-grounds.

So much for the fact; let us now turn to our second question: Is it a grievance? *i.e.* do Dissenters as a whole feel it to be a grievance?

Now of course there is one sense in which it is unquestionably a grievance—namely, the parliamentary and political sense. For the last forty years or so it has been the characteristic—and increasingly so—of Dissent, always to have a grievance. It has come to live upon its grievances more and more, and to use the sharpness of external antagonisms as spurs to its own interior zeal. So far back as the year 1842, Bishop Thirlwall, surely no partial or prejudiced observer, remarks on the changed and changing aspect of Dissent, that whereas

men originally seceded from the Church, 'because they could not find within her pale a sufficient supply for their spiritual wants,' now 'the breach has been widened by the operation of motives and principles foreign to those of its authors.'<sup>1</sup> And what Bishop Thirlwall was keen enough to notice then, has gone on increasingly ever since. In this sense, therefore, we readily admit that it is a grievance. When, however, you pass from the political arena to the actual common life of the Dissenting population, we deny it altogether. Look at the parallel case of marriage. As many as 75 per cent. of all the marriages in England take place in our churches. Now, inasmuch as scarcely any of these will be marriages between Roman Catholics, it follows that a very considerable proportion of the Protestant Dissenters must be married in our churches, by our clergy, and with our service, *as a matter of preference*. Dissenters may, if they choose, be married by their own ministers and in their own meeting-houses. But in a very large proportion of cases they don't choose. Is it to be credited that the ordinary Dissenter feels it such a grievance that his funerals cannot be conducted in a churchyard by his own minister, according to his own fashion, when as a matter of choice he elects to be married by the clergyman according to the rites of the Church? This alone would make us suspect that the grievance is of what we may call the diplomatic order only; but there is more behind.

We have already remarked, when dealing with the question of fact, that the major part of our population, including that part of it where Dissent is most prevalent, depends for its means of sepulture on cemeteries under the Burials Act of 1852, where Churchmen and Dissenters have each their separate grounds, their separate chapels, and equal provision for their several rites. The two stand absolutely on a level, and, if the Dissenter has that great attachment to the funeral ministrations of his own minister of which we hear, it will naturally show itself in these cases where its gratification is specially provided for. But the case turns out all the other way. If we were to estimate the relative proportions of Dissenters and Church people when living from the choice made of their resting-place when dead, Dissent would be at a low numerical ebb indeed. Here is an instructive case from the cemetery register at Stafford. We are told that at the date of opening the cemetery, 1856, much outcry was raised at the Church

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Thirlwall's *Remains*, vol. i. pp. 5. The whole passage, pp. 2-6, is well worth reading.

having two-thirds of the area, on the ground that the funerals of the eight Dissenting bodies would *double* those of the Church. Well, nearly twenty years have gone by, and here is the tabulated official return :—

INTERMENTS IN STAFFORD CEMETERY FROM THE OPENING IN  
FEBRUARY 1856 TO SEPTEMBER 1875.

Period	Church of England	Church of Rome	Noncon- formist	Total
4 years 7 months ending Septem- ber 30, 1860 . . . . .	783	93	67	943
5 years ending September 30, 1865 . . . . .	1,033	144	134	1,311
5 years ending September 30, 1870 . . . . .	1,145	147	128	1,420
5 years ending September 30, 1875 . . . . .	1,325	152	160	1,637
Total . . . . .	4,286	536	489	5,311

Or, take the case of Haverfordwest, one of the worst for our side of the question as being so utterly *Welsh*, and where in one of its parishes, St. Martin's, the clergy admit that the Dissenters are three times as numerous as the Church people. A cemetery was opened in 1858, and divided equally between the Church and the Dissenters, and now the number of interments up to the end of 1875 are :

Church of England portion . . . . .	437
Nonconformist portion . . . . .	156
Total . . . . .	593

But in cases of this kind it is not well to dwell too much on isolated cases, so we will transcribe a number of cases as returned to Parliament, February 23, 1876 (see Table on next page).

One thing is, perhaps, to be regretted in these returns, and that is, that no distinction is made between the cases of Protestant Dissenters and Roman Catholics in the unconsecrated portion. Our readers will see from the completer analysis given above in the case of Stafford that *less than half* of the interments in the unconsecrated portion were those of Protestant Dissenters, and yet if this remark were not made the chances are, that in any parliamentary debate credit might be given to the Nonconformists for the whole number. We

Place	Cemetery Interments	
	In Consecrated Ground	In Unconsecrated Ground
Bagilt, Wales . . . . .	244	73
Birkenhead . . . . .	1,598	265
Burton-on-Trent . . . . .	2,827	659
Cheltenham . . . . .	6,512	897
Chester <sup>1</sup> . . . . .	12,200	1,200
Cockermouth . . . . .	2,203	539
Compton . . . . .	202	0
Ely . . . . .	2,482	610
Hillingdon . . . . .	1,042	54
Masbro' . . . . .	435	45
Reepham . . . . .	162	2
Ruabon, Wales . . . . .	340	84
Stafford . . . . .	4,286	1,025
Upton-on-Severn . . . . .	469	58
Walcot, Bath . . . . .	410	38
Welshpool . . . . .	332	38
Westhoughton . . . . .	1,967	110
Windermere . . . . .	473	25
Total . . . . .	38,184	5,722

could add more cases, but it would only be to burden our pages with the same thing over and over again. One incident, however, which occurred within our own experience, is so illustrative, that we cannot forbear to relate it. More than a dozen years ago, and, therefore, prior to the abolition of Church rates, and before the discovery of this present grievance, we were walking in the 'cemetery' of a considerable town, remarkable for the prevalence of Dissent. As usual, the Dissenting side of the road-way was very sparsely tenanted; but what caught our eyes at once was the extremely small size, in the great majority of instances, of the little mounds which marked the spots of Nonconformist interment. Naturally, we asked the reason. Were all the babies who died in —, Dissenters? Or had there been a special mortality among Nonconformist infants? 'Oh, no,' replied the Vicar, 'but you see the fees to the clergy for their officiating don't prevent adult Dissenters

<sup>1</sup> But Chancellor Espin gives the numbers thus:—

From January 1, 1851, to December 31, 1875—

In Consecrated ground . . . . .	12,823
In Unconsecrated „ . . . . .	552
Proportion . . . . .	23'1



from being brought to us for burial, but they don't think it worth while to pay the difference for a very young child.'

In plain truth, the grievance, if there be a grievance at all, is not that of the Dissenting layman in whose name it is set up. It is that of the Dissenting ministers, who are ever seeking and never finding an equality of *prestige* among their own people with that of the parochial clergyman. Again and again have they imagined it was secured, but it has not come. The right to marry in Dissenting chapels was to have given them more consideration, but unluckily it has only brought out the reverse in more conspicuousness than before, for the Dissenting laity are so indifferent to the privilege of being married by their own ministers, that all the marriages in England, outside the Church, whether at Registrars' offices, Roman Catholic chapels, or Dissenting meeting-houses, do not reach one-fourth of the whole. The cemetery system, with the Dissenters' chapel as much like the Church's as it can be made, and the ground within the self-same wall, was to have put the two upon a level, when, unluckily, the Dissenting layman is once more blind to his advantages, and the Dissenting minister is again deserted by those who voluntarily choose the ministrations of a clergy of whom the Dissenting organs speak as we have seen. It is a strange paradox, this contrast between what we may call the official and parliamentary attitude of Dissent, and the real indifference which must prevail at bottom in so many of those who call themselves Dissenters. There must be a great deal of what is called 'flogging the dead horse' in all that is said and written by the *coryphaei* of the system. And, to our minds, this goes a good way towards explaining the unhallowed alliance which we have seen of late years between the *coryphaei* of Nonconformity and certain sections of the community which the Dissenters of seventy years ago would have never countenanced. Witness their alliance with the Secularists in the matter of education. Seventy years ago, the Dissenters were at least as much in earnest as we now are about the religious character of education. Witness their combination with Mr. Arch and the Labourers' Union. Witness the way in which the Liberation orators, Messrs. Dale and Rogers, spoke at Newcastle-on-Tyne respecting the result of the London School Board election, at a meeting under the chairmanship of Sir J. Cowen, not merely a Radical of the Radicals, but a Radical and something more. Plain it is that it has come to this, that the Liberation Society is perfectly aware that it is only by allying themselves, first, with those who make war upon all religion as such, and next, with those who

make equal war upon all our social and political institutions as such, it is only by this unhallowed triple alliance that they can hope to carry their point. But to carry their point they will do anything. The Burials question is but an infinitesimal grievance, and they know it.

Then, thirdly, there is the inquiry, if the Burials question be a grievance of ever so infinitesimal character, what is the remedy? Certainly *not* the proposed invasion of our churchyards. Such a measure would only intensify the antagonism which its advocates profess a desire to heal. It has been asserted on their side that Dissenters are allowed to bury in the churchyards in Ireland and Scotland with their own services, and that no evil results follow. But what are the facts? First, as to Ireland. The Primate is of a very different opinion. Two Burials Bills were passed for Ireland—one in 1824, the other in 1868—permitting, under certain conditions, the burial of Dissenters in churchyards; and the Primate writes:

‘I do not think either of these Burial Acts has been of the slightest use. *They have had no healing effect*, but, on the contrary, have stirred up strife and *held out invitations* to create parochial quarrels.’

And again:

‘You have in England a variety of hostile Dissenters, and I have no doubt that an Act such as the Burials Act in Ireland would be *a source of unceasing annoyance and dispute*.’

Now with respect to Scotland. The case there is altogether dissimilar. The burial-ground there is not in any way necessarily connected with or adjacent to the kirk. Very frequently it is altogether apart from it. In Scotland there is a common-law obligation upon the proprietors to provide burial-grounds, and, when so provided, they are vested, not in the incumbent, but in the heritors, and are not in the smallest sense ecclesiastical property, or under ecclesiastical control. On the contrary, they are under the management of the heritors; and their leave, not the minister's, has to be asked for any service to be performed in them. In fact, burial in Scotland is very much more a civil matter than with us, and the Westminster Confession forbids a service at the grave. Scotland, therefore, is altogether in different circumstances to England.

But as Mr. Cross observed in his admirable speech of last March, the Scotch precedent may be legitimately pleaded as suggesting the true remedy for our present disputes. In Scotland there is a statutory obligation to provide for the burial of

the dead, and this is a precedent for making it obligatory on parishes or districts to provide graveyards out of public funds, though by no means a precedent for seizing on churchyards which have been provided by private funds to be those graveyards. It is, to say the least, a singular circumstance that in England thus far there has been absolutely no power to compel any neighbourhood, town, or parish to make provision for the burial of its dead. There is none at this moment. Power exists by which the Government may order the closing of a graveyard, but no power exists by which the Government can cause the neighbourhood to provide another. Mr. Cross cited the case of Northampton, where by an order from the Home Office in 1875 all the churchyards were closed:—

‘And there is no power, either by common law or statute, to compel any one of the parishes within that town to provide burial-places for any persons who may die within its limits. The only place where they can be buried at the present moment is in a private cemetery and in unconsecrated ground . . . and if the cemetery to which I have referred was filled to-morrow, there would practically cease to be a burial-ground for the town of Northampton.’

All this points clearly enough to the only real remedy. Before long all or the greater part of our existing churchyards will have to be closed, and then the question will have to be faced, what is to be done to supply their place? It may as well be faced at once, and the question settled. All existing country churchyards which are full, or nearly so, should be closed at once, and an Act passed by which parishes or groups of parishes should be enabled to acquire land for the purpose of burial, borrowing money if need be on the security of the rates for its purchase and laying out, while the cost of maintenance might be defrayed from the fees for the several interments. Power must be lodged with the Central Government to compel, if need be, the local authorities to act, just as in the case of their neglect to enforce vaccination. In this way all, of whatever creed, or of no creed, would stand upon a real equality as regards a burial-ground provided at the common cost and for the common benefit. The Scotch precedent would then be truly followed.

It is not too much to say that this appears to us to be absolutely the *only* way out of the existing difficulty, and the only wonder is that we should have gone on so long without such public provision. Of course it will be resisted by the Nonconformists, because it will deprive them of what they so dearly prize—a factitious grievance. But we have absolutely

no choice in the matter. It is strange, indeed, how any one can imagine that we have. Concede the churchyard, and the Church *must* follow. We have seen that the other side only agitate for the churchyard with a view to the Church. Sir Wilfrid Lawson's words have been often quoted, but they will bear quoting once more. Speaking at Carlisle, in January, 1876, he said :

'Well, but I will be honest. I don't say, "Let us get rid of this and the Church will be the stronger." No. I admit fully, let me be honest about it, that *if you let the Nonconformist into the churchyard, it is only a step towards letting him into the Church*. It is far better to be honest about the thing.'

And what do they want to get into the Church for? Simply as a means for rendering our position intolerable. Parley now is folly. The attempt to satisfy irreconcilables is hopeless. Better far fight the matter out at once and take the consequences, than by weak concession put ourselves in a worse position for the ultimate struggle.<sup>1</sup>

For let no one for a moment doubt that the supreme struggle must come, and that too before many years are over.

<sup>1</sup> We ought not to omit to put on record the remarkable change which has taken place in the Parliamentary divisions on this subject since it was first mooted, as the following Table will show :

	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.
For the Bill . . . . .	223	211	179	280
Against . . . . .	122	149	108	217
Majority <i>for</i> . . . . .	101	62	71	63

	1875.	1876.
Against the Bill . . . . .	248	280
For . . . . .	234	247
Majority <i>against</i> . . . . .	14	33

Further, if we omit the Irish and Scotch votes, this majority in our favour becomes no less than 101! Clearly, therefore, English opinion wants no Burials Bill. Even *The Times*, of May 1875, could write that, 'no one ever hears of an English majority overriding the wishes of Scotch members on any matter of local interest in Scotland;' surely, then, we may claim that on a purely English question the English vote may be regarded as decisive.

The Dissenters—always excepting their ministers—do not care about our burial-grounds in themselves, but the agitators do care a great deal about the *entrée* to them, because it will put them in so much better a position when the disestablishment question shall come on. Our wisdom is to do everything that in us lies to be in the best position to meet that crisis when it comes. The day for concession and conciliation is gone by utterly. Better far to be beaten, if it is to be, without having first rendered ourselves contemptible by unworthy yielding, than to begin by losing alike our own self-respect and the respect of our opponents by what they will regard as inconceivable weakness. But there is not the smallest reason why we should be beaten at all.<sup>1</sup>

---

## SHORT NOTICES.

---

### *THEOLOGY, ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, ETC.*

*Hippolytus and Callistus; or, the Church of Rome in the First Half of the Third Century.* With Special Reference to the Writings of Bunsen, Wordsworth, Baur, and Gieseler. By JOHN G. IGN. VON DÖLLINGER. Translated with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices, by ALFRED PLUMMER, Master of University College, Durham; late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1876.)

FROM May 1839 to the close of the year 1844 the office of Minister of Public Instruction in France was held, with the exception of some seven months in 1840, by M. Villemain. This gentleman, whose wide range of scholarship embraced the study not only of modern letters, but also of Christian as well as of heathen antiquity, honourably distinguished his tenure of power by sending out a Greek student

<sup>1</sup> It is only right that we should here add a word or two on the useful work which is being done by the Church Defence Institution, St. Stephen's Palace Chambers, 9 Bridge Street, Westminster. This Institution confines itself to the one necessary work of *external* defence, a work extremely necessary at the present crisis and which will be increasingly necessary as years go on. To watch the steps, the statements and the misrepresentations of our opponents; to get up the needful facts, figures, and statistics by way of reply; to circulate information and to organise the requisite movements by way of precaution when and where they are needed,—all this dull dry secular work must be done by somebody, and it is well that we should have a special organisation which shall confine itself to this one thing. Such an organisation we have in the Church Defence Institution, and, if properly supported, its value in the course of the next half dozen years may be incalculable.

to Mount Athos with instructions to seek diligently for any treasures that might be lying hidden in those parts. The result was the discovery of a considerable number of valuable manuscripts, which were duly purchased, and in 1842 deposited at Paris in the National Library. Amongst them was a manuscript written on cotton-paper, not on parchment, and apparently of the fourteenth century, which was simply registered as a book *On All Heresies*, without any indication of its date or authorship. But in 1846 a distinguished man of letters, who was a functionary of that library, M. Emmanuel Miller, was struck by finding some fragments of Pindar and of another (unknown) Greek lyricist. A correspondence with learned Germans on these buried gems led to the suggestion that M. Miller should publish the entire work, and in 1850 he offered it to the authorities of the University Press at Oxford. It was accepted by the delegates and published. From this date the work has become associated, though in very different degrees of closeness, with the names of its first editor, M. Miller, of Baron von Bunsen, of Bishop Chr. Wordsworth, of its second editors MM. Duncker and Schneidewin, of Göttingen, of its third editor, M. Cruice, of Dr. Baur of Tübingen, of Dr. Gieseler, of Dean Milman, of Dean Mansel, of Dr. Newman, of Dr. Salmon, of Dr. Jacobi, of Dr. Caspari, of Father Armellini, and of the author of the work before us, Dr. von Döllinger. With these names it is only justice to conjoin Döllinger's translator, Mr. Plummer. He has not only given us an excellent version in good and idiomatic English, but he has added notes, which are terse, brief, and thoroughly to the point, and has discussed in some excellent appendices, criticisms on writers who, having for the most part written since Döllinger, are not referred to in the original work.

It is truly surprising to observe how many in the above list are accused of having, in homely phrase, more or less burnt their fingers in handling this re-discovered treasure. To begin with, there is the first editor, M. Miller. That this gentleman deserves the greatest gratitude for having been the first to discover the value of the manuscript, for having transcribed with such loving care and fidelity and edited it so skilfully, is undeniable. But he fell into the unhappy mistake of heading it *Origenis* [?] *Philosophumena*. Now on this point a warning-post had already been set up nearly 120 years ago. The Benedictine editor of *Origen*, Dom Delarue, had indeed inserted in the first volume one book of *Philosophumena*, of which the Mount Athos manuscript proves to be, though with serious gaps, the continuation. But then Delarue not only relegated this book to an Appendix, but in a brief *Monitum* prefixed to it, assigned his reasons for abjudging it from Origen, laying great stress on a point which has since been felt by all scholars to be fatal to any claim on behalf of Origen, namely, *that the author of the book distinctly announces himself to be a bishop*.

Devoted sons of Oxford—they are happily not few—felt some chagrin at finding their much-loved *Alma Mater* committed, however indirectly, to this grave mistake. And although the suggestion of the name on which most are now agreed is said to have first proceeded

from an Oxford divine, Dr. Barrow, yet it was certainly first brought before the public by the Chevalier Bunsen, at that time Prussian Ambassador in London, and busily engaged with the duties of his office in a peculiarly busy season of the year of the first Great Exhibition in Hyde Park. Of Bunsen's *Hippolytus* we must speak again presently.

On the general contents of the *Philosophumena* or *Refutation of All Heresies*—apart from one peculiar episode—we are glad to find our own impression entirely confirmed by Dean Mansel—one of the few writers who have employed the book in an unpolemical spirit. With him we hold that, Hippolytus has not attempted what would now be considered a philosophical or theological refutation of the numerous heresies described by him, but is content with showing that the doctrines in question were derived from heathen sources and consequently cannot be recognised in his own language 'as divine' (*ὡς θεῖα*, *Phil.* ix. 31).

What are we to say of the volume of the Bishop of Lincoln? The deep respect which that prelate is winning from Churchmen for his lofty tone and (too often isolated) displays of courage in the discharge of his episcopal duties, makes us regret that we have occasion to refer to it. But none are always at their best. The episode in the ninth book of the *Philosophumena*, in which Hippolytus makes a fierce attack upon Callistus, Bishop of Rome, seems to have attracted the entire attention of the then Canon of Westminster: and not all the curious information conveyed in the *obiter dicta* of the volume can raise it above the level of a *pièce de circonstance*—a merely anti-Papal pamphlet, only too much in the style of Exeter Hall.

The attack upon Callistus by Hippolytus may be briefly summed up as follows:—That in the reign of Commodus (A.D. 180-192) Callistus, being a slave, had been allowed by his master to set up as a money-changer; that Christians deposited money with him, as a fellow-Christian; that Callistus failed and fled; that he was found by his master on board a ship at Portus, and caught, though he plunged into the sea; was sent to the tread-mill (*πίστρινος*, *pistrinum*); that he was allowed to come out that he might collect money from some Jews, who were in his debt: that in attempting this collection Callistus was accused of having disturbed a synagogue and was condemned to penal servitude in the mines of the island of Sardinia; that a Christian presbyter, Hyacinth, came over to Sardinia, having been sent by Marcia, who was from a Christian point of view the wife of the Emperor Commodus (a lady always kindly disposed to the Christians), to set free the confessors for the faith, who had been banished thither; that Callistus, though not named upon the list, persuaded Hyacinth to free him also; that some time after, Zephyrinus, Bishop of Rome from A.D. 202 to 218, took Callistus into great favour, gave him charge of the great cemetery [the one ever since called by its guardian's name], and made him what would now be called an archdeacon; Zephyrinus being ignorant and covetous and Callistus a clever flatterer; that at the death of Zephyrinus, Callistus managed to get himself elected Bishop of



Rome, and that under both himself and his predecessor there was a general relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline (especially in the matter of criminal bishops and clergy, and of the marriage-laws for the laity), and on the part of Callistus a lapse into a new form of heresy, apparently (according to his accuser) some strange commixture of Noetianism and Sabellianism.

The extraordinary character of these charges, the acrimony with which they are urged, the evident tendency on the part of the writer to impute the very worst motives to every act and word of Callistus, must startle almost every student of the *Philosophumena*. Even Bunsen grants that Hippolytus seems, like the Jansenists of a later age, to be unreasonably strict on all the points relating to discipline.

An able critic in the *Guardian* of June 8, 1853, while accepting the rest of the work as genuine and authentic, suggests that the ninth book may be, or rather must be, spurious. But this view, though set forth with much acuteness and with the most evident desire to be fair and impartial, does not appear to us, on examination, to be tenable. The chapters concerning Callistus, though displaying a white heat of passion, far removed from the calmness pervading the rest of the treatise, are so naturally interwoven with matter thoroughly germane to the book that it seems impossible to separate them. This is, we think, the all but unanimous voice of criticism.

Next let us look at the line taken by a Jesuit Father, Armellini, and an Oratorian Father, Dr. Newman. They decline to believe that the work can proceed from the pen of Hippolytus. Their arguments appear to come almost to this. Grave and learned theologians do not lose their tempers and write anything like libels; and, above all, they do not attack the Bishop of Rome. Hippolytus was all this and more. Consequently he did not write the book. This mode of reasoning reminds us a little of the letter (so little worthy of its author) which Dr. Newman wrote a few years ago concerning Anglican Orders. Mr. Plummer's reply seems to us excellent. He adduces the example of S. Jerome. Assuredly, if certain of that Father's polemical writings now came to light for the first time, they might on the above principle be stigmatised as spurious.

Of Dean Milman's acceptance of Bunsen's view of the case and rejection of Döllinger we will only say that, while we are not yet prepared to commit ourselves to the acceptance of all Dr. Döllinger's positions, we cannot credit Milman with that impartiality which some seem to assign to him. He has, to say the very least, fits of partiality. Witness his extraordinary gentleness towards the character of the fierce and intolerant Nestorius. Dr. Döllinger's masterly volume certainly merits a treatment very different from the off-hand dismissal accorded to it in the latest edition of *Latin Christianity*. It is indeed, as Milman calls it, an *Apologia pro Callisto*; but we cannot follow the Dean in thinking it a wholly unsuccessful one. On the contrary, to our thinking, a strong case is made out by Döllinger.

Of Bunsen's four volumes, of which about one-and-a-half refer to Hippolytus, it must be said, that with all their grievous faults.

alike in the method of the research and of the temper displayed, they were intended by their author to aid the cause of belief against unbelief. The denunciations of the sceptical eighteenth century, and of the modern school of despair in French letters, headed by Victor Hugo, Dumas, and Balzac, are hearty and sincere; and the vehement anti-Tractarian outbursts are no doubt uttered under the conviction that the Anglo-Catholic movement would lead men to scepticism. The author has a creed, but it must, we fear, be termed Bunsenism. It is as far removed from the teaching of Puritanism, in any form, as from that of High Churchmen. As a specimen of investigation, clever and plausible as it often is, it presents specimens of every conceivable fault which the student ought to avoid: a large induction based on a single instance, and that a doubtful one; a theory built upon the basis of a mass of incorrect details; a determination to see whatever he wishes to see, and to imagine that lost passages must have contained what the writer thinks ought to have been there; all this fully justifies the wish expressed by Dr. Döllinger (p. 8) 'that the German language was as rich in softer periphrases and synonyms for the blunt expressions, untruth, distortions, inventions, as the Arabic is in synonyms for "camel."'

There are many theological students who do not read German, or who read it but slowly and with difficulty. Mr. Plummer has provided such with a work from which they can hardly fail to learn a great deal, even if they still remain oppressed by the sense of a difficult problem not wholly solved. When Dr. Döllinger wrote this volume, he was still in full communion with the Church of Rome. We must say that the deep and varied studies needed for its preparation are not such as would be likely to lead any man in the direction of an acceptance of the Vatican decrees.

*Ungedruckte Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Concils von Trident.* Herausgegeben von J. v. DÖLLINGER. 1876. (Unprinted Reports and Journals relating to the History of the Council of Trent.)

THIS work is the first of two volumes, which the learned von Döllinger is editing, in illustration of the history of the Council of Trent. When Ranke, at the close of his luminous comparison of the two great historians of the Tridentine Council (*Popes*, App. sect. ii.), expressed his belief that the Council had lost much of its original interest, and that a true history of it would never be undertaken, because 'those who could fulfil the task will not, and those who would, have not the means,' he perhaps uttered a true prophecy. Nevertheless, he was unable to foresee either the interest with which subsequent events would invest it, or the amount of documents which in various ways would see the light. To members of the Reformed faith, the Tridentine Council had always been interesting only as an historic chapter of the sixteenth century; and in our own Church, and even to a great degree in the Church of Rome, attention had been mainly concentrated on the *doctrinal* decisions of the Council. But the recent Vatican Council at once turned the attention of Roman Catholic divines to

other aspects of the Council, which were found to have a living interest in reference to the new Council at Rome. The order of procedure at Trent, especially in the opening period of the Council; the mode of voting and of debate; the great questions which came under discussion in the closing period of the Council, such as the relation of the Roman Curia to native Churches, which was involved in the attitude of the Gallican Court, and the relation of Bishops to the Pope, hotly discussed by the Spanish Bishops:—these and such like points have acquired since recent events a real and living meaning. And we cannot wonder that theologians like Döllinger, who feel themselves to be the intellectual descendants of the more liberal thinkers at Trent, evince a keen and novel interest in the history of the Tridentine Council, and publish any documents which may throw light upon it, and more especially upon the chapters of its history, in which such topics as those just named emerge into view. Dr. Döllinger's book, of which we have above given the title, is, however, in no sense controversial; and therefore it is not ephemeral. But the above suggestion as to the motive which may have drawn Döllinger's attention to the special documents now published, will at least enable the reader to understand the bearing of them, and will explain the portions of the history on which they throw light.

Dr. Döllinger, in a clearly written preface, first gives an account, nearly complete, of the literature bearing on the history of the Council; and then a literary history of these special writings, which he now edits from MSS. They are eight in number. The first is a narrative, in Latin, taken from a MS. at Naples, by Seripando, General of the Augustinians and subsequently Cardinal Legate; which relates to the opening of the first great period of the Council (viz. the close of the year 1545 and the beginning of 1546). Seripando's object seems to have been an explanation of his own conduct. The second work, also in Latin, from a MS. at Trent, and relating to the same period, is a history or almost a day-book, by an anonymous author (Dr. Döllinger successfully showing that it must not be given to the writer to whom it has been previously attributed). The third and fourth, partly in Latin, partly in Italian, also from the library at Trent, relate respectively to the history of the first great period of session (1545-7), and to the commencement of the second period (1551). The first is the private diary, in full, of the celebrated Masarelli, who, as private secretary to the Legates, had perfect knowledge of everything, and was employed by them to reduce the *Acta* of the Council,—which, now inaccessible in the Vatican, were formerly used by Pallavicini and partly edited by Theiner. This diary is the most important document in the collection now published, eminently on account of the light which it throws on the discussions of the Legates and others during the few months preceding the opening of the Council in 1545. The four other narratives are nevertheless of great interest. They relate wholly to the third period of the Council (1562-3). Of these, the first is in Italian, by Musotti, the secretary of the above-named Seripando. It is a 'Summary'—an historic sketch, in good perspective, by a very sensible observer. The next is

a short diary in Italian, from a Bodleian MS., sketching the same period, by Servantio, the secretary of the beforesaid Masarelli.

The two remaining narratives are important, as being by a Spaniard and a Frenchman respectively, and unveiling the attitude of these respective parties in the Council on great practical questions such as clerical residence. The first of the two, by Mendoza, Bishop of Salamanca, who was in the secrets of Philip II., is in Spanish, with the speeches delivered by him in Latin. The speeches are not forceful, but they are brief; their author at least had the merit of knowing that in committee a person ought to speak concisely. This work throws great light on the discussions which took place on the authority of the Episcopate; its divine right; its relation to the Presbyterate and to the Papacy. The remaining work is in Latin, by a Frenchman, Pseume, who was associated with the Cardinal of Lorraine, and who shows himself to have been at the Council rather the politician than the theologian.

This brief sketch will explain the nature of Döllinger's present work. We consider that the MSS., the most part of which are now published for the first time, will afford valuable contemporary materials for any one who may study or write upon the history of the Council. The book ought to find a place in all important Libraries.<sup>1</sup>

*The Persecution of Diocletian: A Historical Essay.* By A. J. MASON, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Deighton, Bell and Co., Cambridge, 1875.)

This is an important book and well deserves a more extended and critical notice than we can afford the space for. It is the expansion and completion of an Essay which obtained the Hulsean Prize two

<sup>1</sup> An interesting topographical question exists as to the spots in Trent where the Council was held. On this point little distinct light is thrown by these documents. The Cathedral, a magnificent Romanesque structure, was the place where all the *Sessions* or great general meetings for voting were held; at least this is certain in reference to the first period of the Council. The ancient palace adjoining the Cathedral on the north (now a prison and court-house) may be conjectured to be the palace (so often spoken of in these documents) where the *Congregations* or committees met during the same period. But there is also an interesting church, Santa Maria Maggiore, which the modern guide-books state to have been built since the Council on the site of the Council Hall. The antiquary, however, will detect, in the campanile and the north wall of this Church, work older than the 16th century;—a view which the sacristan confirms. It may be conjectured that it was an ancient church, partly reconstructed in the 16th century. The mention of it in these documents first occurs in connexion with the second great meeting, viz. 1551. It was, perhaps, then used for the Council. Certainly in the third great meeting, 1562, the *Congregations* or debating committees were held in it; and perhaps also the *Sessions* for voting the Decrees and Canons. A picture of this third meeting of the Council (with portraits) exists in the Church, executed soon after the end of the 16th century. A drawing of it is to be seen in Mendham. The President sits at the north side of the nave. The members of the Council are represented as seated round the President in a semicircle, like a modern foreign House of Parliament.

years ago, and as such is therefore a young man's work. Rarely has it fallen to our lot to see so much maturity, so much real grasp, so much historic insight, and so much cool critical perception in the work of so young a man. There is great boldness of treatment and at the same time great skill in setting out not merely results, but the grounds of his views, while at the same time these last, though fully set out, are so managed as not to interfere with the course of his narrative or the effectiveness of his picture.

It is scarcely possible to give a good idea of the book as a whole in a short space, but we may mention that its object is to give a true picture of what we may call the *politics* of the Diocletian persecution. This involves a view of the whole Diocletian régime, of Diocletian's reconstruction of the Empire and its administration, his general views of policy, the personal characteristics of Diocletian himself, and the characters of his fellow-Augustus and of his subordinate Cæsars. This done, Mr. Mason traces out the way in which Diocletian was led, tortured, and bullied—we have to use plain words to save space—into sanctioning the persecution. He shows conclusively that he had nothing, and *could* have had nothing, to do with the 'fourth edict,' and, in a word, he exhibits him as the real parent of that policy towards the Church which ripened only under Constantine.

As to minor matters, one of the points which will be most amusing, and certainly not the least interesting, to the reader, is Mr. Mason's almost humorous account (see pp. 318, &c.) of Maximin's attempt to create a sort of Pagan Church which might serve as a counterpoise to the Christian. The only criticism we have to offer is as to a single point of style. Mr. Mason has a keen sense of humour, as all really able men must have; and most valuable it is to its possessor in the construction of such a narrative as this. But now and then Mr. Mason—as it seems to us—lets its keen edge cut his own fingers, and indulges in little turns of phrase which have a side thrust for things and circumstances of the actual moment, and in allusions of which the point will be lost when a dozen years have gone by. Such a book as this is not likely to be ephemeral, and Mr. Mason is certainly one from whom we may look for work that will last. These little ephemeral references, therefore, are not worth admitting into his pages.

*The History, Art, and Palæography of the Manuscript styled the Utrecht Psalter.* By WALTER DE GRAY BIRCH, F.R.S.L., Senior Assistant of the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum. (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1876.)

FEW manuscripts have been the subject of such eager discussion as this Psalter, once in the library of Sir Robert Cotton; then lost or stolen; and finally finding rest by some unknown chance in the University Library of Utrecht. Not only for its interest as one of the most ancient, if not the very earliest extant examples of the *Quicunque*, but also for the singular beauty and skill alike of its calligraphy and of its pictured illustration, this manuscript has excited

a keener interest than any other surviving relic of ancient times. The volume before us is a proof of this. The writer is free from all bias of theological partisanship, either for or against the Creed. He regards the Psalter simply as an ancient manuscript, and the duty that he sets himself to perform is first to give a thoroughgoing examination and description of it, and then to determine, as far as he finds himself in a position to do so, its authorship, and the age in which it was produced. He has further enriched his work by prefixing autotype reproductions of (1) a sheet of the Psalter itself; (2) sheets of the Harley Psalter now in the British Museum; and (3) of the Tripartite Psalter of Eadwine from the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge; both of which are believed to have been copied from the Utrecht manuscript.

We have not space to follow Mr. Birch's arguments step by step; it must suffice to state briefly, for our readers' information, those conclusions in which he differs from preceding writers.

As to the date of the manuscript, Mr. Birch believes himself to have demonstrated, by an induction of extant examples, in the course of his inquiry, that whereas it was the custom during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries to execute manuscripts in uncial characters *wholly*, or in the variety of uncial, called rustic, *wholly*, whilst another and less dignified class, including the *papyri*, were in cursive characters *only*, no example occurs of a manuscript executed partly in uncial and partly in rustic character, before the seventh century; to which accordingly, or rather to the beginning of the eighth,<sup>1</sup> he would assign this Psalter.

He appears to make this his palmary argument by which he elects to stand or fall. To this argument he subordinates all considerations as to Byzantine character of ornament, or classical forms of buildings or arms which have been adduced in favour of an earlier date.

His theory as to the history of the manuscript is novel and curious. He disposes, more or less convincingly, of Sir Thomas D. Hardy's connexion of it with Queen Bertha and (by gift from her) with the monastery of Reculver. His view is that it was executed (by whom there is nothing to show—'not far from England at any rate') for Berwald, who was Archbishop of Canterbury from A.D. 693 to 731, and was intended 'for a royal owner, or even for himself'; that it was then embellished by the hands of 'some one or more' artists, 'who formed their ideas on what to them were ancient and classical models.' And it will be observed that he accounts for the Byzantine

<sup>1</sup> 'And it has been shown that the Rustic character was employed solely and to the exclusion of all others, in single entire manuscripts, as late as the sixth century, and was in its prime at that time, as exhibited by the manuscripts discussed in the early pages of this work; while to the seventh and eighth centuries belong the mixture of rustics and uncials seen in several instances, where the letters are even stronger and more naturally made than those in the Utrecht Psalter. We may not, therefore, date the manuscript older than the beginning of the eighth century, a period when, as is well known, the employment of these characters was passing through a transitional stage.'—(p. 384.)

character of much of the illustration, by boldly declaring that all art at that time was Byzantine; 'they really are in a great measure common to the whole cycle of Western pictorial representations at this early period'—(p. 315). For an indefinite time certainly (however it may have got there) it remained in the *scriptorium* of Canterbury, and whilst there was copied (as far as the paintings) by a monk named Eadwine belonging to the monastery, whose work we have in the Tripartite Psalter now at Trinity College, Cambridge, and in 1315, according to the Cotton manuscript, Galba, E. iv. (Birch, p. 102), itself also in the Cathedral library. It also appears to have been imitated in the 'Harley Psalter' (Brit. Mus.), though Canon Swainson has the idea that the Harley Psalter is the older, and that the Utrecht Psalter is copied from it; as to which Mr. Birch expresses: 'There is no doubt,' he says, 'and there never could be to any reasonable person, that the drawings of the Utrecht Psalter are the older'—(p. 116). Sir T. Hardy expresses himself even more strongly in the same sense.

The theological interest in this volume is, as we have said, very much obscured by the antiquarian. But it is evident that for the defenders of the Creed, a date of (say) A.D. 710 is just as good as one a hundred years further back. A.D. 710 takes the authorship of the Creed far anterior (*e.g.*) to the later Fortunatus (of Gradus), who lived in the *ninth* century; and thus we are thrown back upon Venantius Fortunatus of Poitiers, who died A.D. 609, for the authorship of the *Commentary* on the Creed. When we have traced it back so far, we are within two hundred years of S. Athanasius himself, so that the tradition which has ascribed the work to him assumes a proportionately greater weight. As far as the Creed is concerned, it will hardly be too much to assert that the battle respecting its authenticity is already gained for the orthodox side.

We could have wished to put before our readers our author's most interesting treatment of the singular and significant drawing prefixed to the *Quicumque vult* itself as it appears in the Utrecht Psalter; but space will not allow us to do this.

We can only further recommend the volume to our readers as one of great interest and permanent usefulness. The author's large experience in palæographic researches, the care which he takes to base his conclusions on the largest possible number of examples, and the sobriety of his judgment, render this work in an especial degree important and trustworthy; and it will be found to enter sufficiently into the general subject of palæography to give it an independent value of its own, which may endure when the temporary interest in its subject shall have passed away.

*The Offices of the Old Catholic Prayer-Book.* Done into English, and compared with the Offices of the Roman and Old German Rituals. (Oxford and London: James Parker and Co.)

THIS little volume is the translation into English of the *Katholisches Rituale*, published at Bonn in 1875, *Beschlüsse der zweiten Synode der Altkatholiken des deutschen Reichs*. It contains offices for Baptism, Con-



firmation, Confession, Communion, Matrimony, Churching, Burial, and some minor forms ; with an appendix of prayers for private and individual use, which strongly reminds us of the various 'Primers' whose publication ushered in the Reformation in England, and has very probably been caused in this case by the pressure of a similar necessity. A marked endeavour throughout is to make devotional forms simpler, and devotion more individual, more intelligent, more rational. The *modus operandi* is very similar to that adopted by the compilers of the Anglican Offices. Addresses are inserted at the beginning and end of each formulary, generally most remarkable for their piety and intelligent appreciation of the great points of doctrine. But they sometimes contrast violently with the ceremonies themselves, e.g. in the address to the people after a Baptism, which is evidently intended to prepare them for the disuse of those redundant and unnecessary ritual acts, of exorcism, of anointing with oil and with saliva, and so on, in which it has followed closely the Roman Ritual. We presume it was deemed important to give no occasion to the Papal party to deny the validity of Old Catholic baptisms. The same may be said of the 'Order for Confirmation,' a dignified and noble office, though we must somewhat wonder that opportunity has not been taken to direct the confirmands (as they are, in fact, directed in the Strasburg Ritual) to repeat aloud the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. The Roman Rubrics with regard to Confession are all dropped. The indicative form of Absolution is, however, retained, though it is significant that all mention and release from '*omni* vinculo excommunicationis, suspensionis, et interdicti' is silently omitted. We learn from the introduction that this indicative form is one of the things to be altered at a fit season.

The Mass is separated from the order of Communion, although a rubric is inserted that it 'is if possible to be administered during the Mass, after the Communion of the Priest.' It is preceded by a short form of Confession and Absolution, and forms a brief 'Companion to the Altar.' Communion is only in one kind as yet, although we learn that the custom of the Eastern and English Churches is considered the right one in this particular, and the Old Catholics are prepared to adopt it. Communion of the Sick is, of course, with the Reserved Sacrament, and there is to be either a private Confession or the general form ; and apparently, in the latter case, no Absolution, which seems a defect. 'Unction of the Sick' is a translation of the Roman Ritual.

The address before 'Solemnisation of Matrimony' is general and jejune. It is permitted to vary the ceremonies considerably, and to omit certain of them according to local custom. Separate forms are provided for the burial of an adult and of a child, the latter a very beautiful one. The entire volume is very full of interest. We must regard it as one step in that ritual displacement which is taking place among the Old Catholics, and that not the final one. It remains yet to be proved whether their lay members sympathise or no with this forward movement. If they do, then we shall speedily see the issue of another edition, in which the simplification of the

Offices, avowed in the preface to the present book as desirable, will actually be carried out. That the compilers of the present edition are prepared to go further, and have gone as far as they thought prudent already, is perfectly evident. That the same sound and, as we think, conservative instinct which has ruled in this revision, may also rule in any future one, must be the hope of all English Churchmen. There are certainly some usages strange to Anglican eyes. But *facilis descensus Avernii*. The loss which our own Church sustained by exchanging the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. for the Second Prayer-Book presses upon us too painfully in various ways to make it possible that we should urge others to further change.

*The First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.* Compared with the successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer. Also a Concordance to the Rubrics in the several Editions. (Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1877.)

THIS is really the first time that we have had any single publication from which we could ascertain at a glance the whole series of variations in the successive revisions of the Prayer-Book from 1549 to 1662. We do not mean to say that the attempt has not been made before. Mr. Clay in 1841, and Mr. Keeling in 1842, have both of them rendered good service in the same direction, but the difficulty in doing it thoroughly is much greater than any one would suppose who has not tried it; and valuable as their works are, especially Mr. Keeling's, one can scarcely say that you could ascertain, 'at a glance,' all you wanted from either of them. Besides which, each of these authors took the 1662 book as their basis and worked backwards from it, showing, as well as they could, the successive *previous* forms of the Services.

Here, on the contrary, the primary edition of 1549 is taken as the basis and printed *in extenso* at the head of the page, with the subsequent variations in their order below. Actual use, and that extended over some time, is the only real test of the success of matters of arrangement like this, but so far as an opinion founded on mere inspection can go, we expect that the present volume will do all that a student will require. Absolute certainty, however, may be ascribed at once to our prophecy of the value and usefulness of two new features in the book: (1) the *numbering* of the rubrics in the 1549 book, with an Appendix, giving a complete list of the rubrics in their changed orders, so as to facilitate a comparison of the changing structure of the Service under the different systems; and (2) a Concordance tracing the occurrence and the use of technical words all down the successive Prayer-Books. This last is a most happy contrivance, and though some persons might not at once think of its value, yet the most cursory inspection will show its importance in a moment. Altogether the book is a most welcome, and we venture to predict that it will prove a most valuable, help to Prayer-Book students; and it is to be followed by a companion volume giving an account of the successive Revisions, which if skilfully done will be

at least equally welcome. It only remains to add that the book is excellently well printed—a matter of no small consequence in a case of this kind.

*Memorials of the South Saxon See and Cathedral Church of Chichester.*

By the Rev. W. R.W. STEPHENS, M.A., Prebendary of Chichester, and Rector of Woolbeding, Sussex. (London : Bentley, 1876.)

THE value of this book is very varied, but always real, and we hope that it may not end with itself, but may stir up other members of our Cathedral foundations to similar good works. To begin with, it has the interest which cannot help attaching to any authentic record of a foundation which has braved the battle and the breeze of the full twelve centuries of national and ecclesiastical vicissitudes which have elapsed since Wilfrid founded the South Saxon See in its original home at Selsey. Next, it has all the accessory interest arising from the interlacing of national and general history with the local annals which comes about in consequence of the part which the more distinguished Bishops in mediæval times had to play in the affairs of their time. And then, thirdly, it is important as a reliable contribution to the history of the way in which, through centuries of oscillations, our Cathedral bodies, of the old foundation, have come to their present condition. This is not the place in which to venture an essay on the state, the functions, and the prospects of these foundations. If it were, Mr. Stephens' book would furnish an excellent starting-point for such an endeavour. As it is, we can only deal with the book as it stands, and a most curiously interesting book it is. Chichester seems always to have been a quiet little See, and yet its history cuts across the history of the Church and nation in a multitude of points, and Mr. Stephens has made the names of S. Richard, of Bishop Gilbert de Sancto Leofardo, to say nothing of the well-known Bishop Pecock, and above all of Bishop Sherburne, live before us with a truthful artlessness which we cannot too highly commend. We cannot but hope that his work may stimulate other members of Cathedral foundations to like efforts. If the history and objects of Cathedral foundations had been anything like as well understood forty years ago as they are now, the miserable Cathedral Act of 1840 could never have passed ; and in spite of all the uncertainties of our prospects, it cannot be doubted that Cathedral bodies have a future of usefulness to look to.

The illustrations of contemporary life and manners are simply infinite. Here is a quaint one. Among the letters from his steward to Bishop Ralph Neville [1224-1245] occurs the following paragraph :—

'I think you ought to know that the vicar of Mundham keeps two wives ; he pretends to have a Papal dispensation, contrary to the statutes of a general council'—(p. 80.)

*A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.* By the Rev. W. DENTON, M.A., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Cripplegate. Vol. II. (London : Bell and Daldy, 1876.)

WE have left this valuable book too long unnoticed. And yet we

hope that there has been little need to notice it, seeing that it is not the inception of a new work, but the completion of one commenced some time ago. It was in 1874 that Mr. Denton published the first volume of his Commentary on the Acts, and now, after two years, we have the second and concluding volume. It is a very complete, very elaborate, and at the same time a singularly well-arranged and usable book. We have gone through the greater part of the whole volume and scarcely find a point omitted, and the results of very wide reading are so tersely and neatly given, they are so judiciously condensed and dovetailed, that it is difficult to speak too highly of the skill and care with which the book has been adapted to the needs alike of the reader who refers to it only for a particular question, or the student who is working through it in detail.

Mr. Denton's method is to print first a verse, or a few verses of the text, where necessary inserting a word or two of the Greek original, and then to give what is necessary of general exposition in large type. Detailed matters of criticism, questions of various readings, or special verbal illustrations or explanations—these are appended in footnotes of smaller type; and then, thirdly, at the end of each chapter comes a group of longer 'Notes' on such matters as demand more extended treatment. These are often really very full and valuable *excursus*. Thus, for example, Chapter xiii. is followed *inter alia* by an elaborate note on Synagogue; Chapter xiv. by an excellent note on *ἐκπαροῦεῖν*; xv. by one on the Council at Jerusalem, in which the literature on the subject is well summarised. 'Confirmation,' and the 'Baptism of John,' are very fully treated in 'Notes' which follow Chapter xix.; and so on. We need hardly add that all necessary information as to place and countries, Jewish opinion and practice, Roman usages, legal matters, and the like, is given copiously in these Notes.

When so much is given us, and so well given, by one who is so evidently a master in the art of commenting, it seems almost ungracious to raise a question at all, and yet we should like to offer a suggestion or two to Mr. Denton with a view to any future edition. On xvi. 6, 7, Mr. Denton rightly calls attention to the twice repeated notice that the lines of journey which S. Paul's own choice would have taken were not sanctioned by the Holy Spirit. But for anything we can find, we do not see that Mr. Denton has observed that it is the uniform practice of the writer of the Acts to call special attention to the circumstance that not merely one or two, but *every* critical step taken in S. Paul's whole career was at the special and overt dictation and direction of the Holy Ghost. Now bearing in mind that the book of the Acts was written subsequently to that strong personal opposition to S. Paul's Apostleship, which he has to combat in the Epistles to the Corinthians and the Galatians, who can help seeing a very strong *purpose* in thus calling constant attention to the fact that all his important steps were taken under definite Divine authority? Converted by the personal intervention of the Lord, 'separated' to his special work at the special command of the Holy Ghost, and then, after his recognition at the

Council as having a special divine mission to the Gentiles, what more natural—not to say necessary—than that the writer should show that his great venture, not merely beyond the bounds of Palestine, but even into Europe itself, was not in the least of his own mind, but brought about, not by one or even two, but by three Divine interpositions? He wished to go into Proconsular Asia. The Spirit suffered him not. *He* would then have turned northwards towards Bithynia; but again the Spirit suffered him not. There was but one course left, and that to go right on. So he reached the verge of the ocean, and came to Troas. What next? The ocean was not to stop him, but he must cross it and go over into Macedonia. Once more. Up to this time S. Paul seems always to have observed the old rule, 'When they persecute you in one city flee into another.' When is it first broken and why? It is on this same journey, and at Corinth, when on the outbreak of persecution a vision bids S. Paul *stay* there, for no man shall be allowed to hurt him. It is the same with the voyage to Rome. The appeal to Cæsar was but the following out of the Divine direction in xxiii. 2. Mr. Denton notices this last, but does not see that it is a link in the long chain which shows that each detail of his unparalleled career was one of Divine direction, not of self-chosen labour. We could pursue this much further, but space fails us. A like remark might be made upon the sermons and speeches of S. Paul. Here, again, Mr. Denton explains each in itself; but he hardly recognises their mutual relations, and how the series taken as a whole *forms* a whole. We ought to apologise for the lengthiness of these remarks, but, as it seems to us, it is only on this side that Mr. Denton's work can bear amendment—the side namely of broad, comprehensive grouping of details, so as to master the general ideas which underlie the whole. Otherwise the book is as nearly perfect as can be, and we hope it will be in the hands of every clergyman and every student.

*The St. James's Lectures: Companions of the Devout Life.* Seven Lectures delivered in St. James's Church, Piccadilly, A.D. 1876. Second Series. (London: John Murray, 1876.)

THESE are excellent Lectures, containing much good information, much discriminating criticism and not a little sound and sober guidance. They are not all of equal merit, neither are they all of the same kind of merit. Of the Lecturers, there are some who have evidently made it their object to write such a Lecture as would be tolerably complete, without exceeding the time usually allotted to delivery. Others have evidently been determined to treat their subject thoroughly and, as we should suppose, have had future readers rather than present hearers most in view. Thus Mr. T. T. Carter's magnificent Lecture on Fénelon's 'Œuvres Spirituelles' and Canon Barry's very able Lecture on the Christian Year, are almost criticisms at large, and it is difficult to imagine how their delivery could have been accomplished within moderate limits of time. Equally difficult is it to imagine how their writers could have omitted any portions in delivery without spoiling the whole. On the other hand, Bishop

Woodford's Lecture on Bishop Andrewes' Devotions, and Canon Ashwell's on the 'Theologia Germanica,' though very much condensed, are both capital specimens of what may be done within the limits of a Lecture, and it is evident that in each case we have before us the genuine Lecture as it was delivered.

Two Deans, those of Chester and Chichester, give us rather elaborate papers, the former on Bunyan's 'Pilgrim,' and the latter on the Prayer-Book. Dean Howson brings out very fairly the strong points of that really wonderful book, which to our minds has scarcely met with full appreciation from the cultured and educated classes; and we heartily wish that some one who combines breadth of view and penetrating insight would take up the subject. Dean Burgon gives us a perfect avalanche of remarks upon the Book of Common Prayer, very suggestive many of them, and pointing out many a way of turning its teachings to good account, some of them perhaps a little unsuspected hitherto, as when he tells us that he finds 'constant comfort as well as guidance in the thirty-nine Articles.' Mr. Bickersteth lectures pleasantly on the 'Paradise Lost,' but theorises not a little about Satan, whom he considers to have been an unfallen angel until the moment of his tempting our first parents.

On the whole, the book is well worth buying, and there are Lectures in it which will bear reading again and again.

*Lectures on the Holy Catholic Church.* By the Rev. A. R. ASHWELL, M.A., Canon of Chichester. Delivered in St. Peter's Church, Eaton Square, during Lent 1876. (Mozley and Smith, London, 1876.)

THE adjectives we should apply to this series are 'useful' and 'comprehensive.' They were delivered on Sunday afternoons, apart from the evensong of the Church, much as the University Sermons are at Oxford and Cambridge, and are much longer than ordinary sermons. Canon Ashwell goes over a very large surface, first explaining the Scriptural idea of the 'Church,' next its function in the Divine and supernatural apparatus for the renewal and the training of the Christian soul; then he takes up the notes of the Church and its historical development, as shown in the New Testament; after that he shows the correspondence of the Church of England to this primitive model, dealing very quietly with the contrasted errors of the Roman and the Nonconformist theories of the Church, and then, lastly, vindicating, as we think, very powerfully the 'establishment' idea from the reproach of being a mere matter of expediency or convenience. The concluding Lecture being delivered on Palm Sunday, with Good Friday and Easter Eve full in view, the Canon took the article 'Descended into Hell' for his subject, and explained it very thoroughly as a *necessary* portion of the Lord's human experience, and as, so to speak, filling up the measure of His Incarnation. Altogether there is an immense amount of *teaching* in these Lectures; and, being delivered extempore and printed from the shorthand-writer's notes, there is a freedom of style about them which makes them very easy reading. A little redundant, perhaps, the style is here and there, with

a little repetition, such as is incident to extempore addresses, but it does not make them less readable. The Lecture which will be the most interesting is No. vi., on the Descent into Hell and the Intermediate State. The Lecture which we most wish to see read and pondered is No. v., on 'Church and State.' We notice that Canon Ashwell prefixes a useful summary of the several Lectures by way of 'Contents.'

*Current Coin.* By the Rev. H. R. HAWEIS, M.A. (London : Henry S. King and Co.)

SURELY Providence in its wisdom intended Mr. Haweis for a popular lecturer, and it is only the irony of froward circumstance which in its unwisdom has set him in the pulpit. He has the most remarkable felicity in putting what he has to say into popular and telling forms, and the present book is quite a study as regards popular and engaging style. It is the same with his subjects. So long as he keeps clear of what he calls religion, we can go heartily with him and wish him success in his tilts against the great and unwieldy, but none the less mischievous, monsters of our day. Crime, pauperism, drunkenness, recreation—these essays are all of one class, and the class is one which Mr. Haweis has the faculty of treating with infinite pathos, picturesqueness, and (rarest gift of all) with real humour. Of course it is one side only of any subject that he ever gives ; for *that* is the primary condition of success in such lecturing as this. Thinkers may be won and convinced by putting the whole of a subject before them ; but popular audiences must never be shown both the silver and the golden sides of the shield, or they will believe in neither.

But when Mr. Haweis comes to teach religion he makes a sad spectacle of himself ; for religion practically means with him that which seems good to Mr. Haweis ; and great and good as Mr. Haweis may doubtless be, the gathered results of the religious experience of mankind up till to-day (he would no doubt accuse us of begging the question, did we call it by its true name—the Divine Revelation and Oracles of God) are something a little greater and better than even Mr. Haweis' intuitions. Thus it is that he is betrayed into writing such arrant nonsense. He has treated his readers to a jaunty dissertation on 'The Devil,' in which two of his premisses out of every three are unproved assumptions, and his conclusion a *non sequitur*. For since Mr. Haweis does himself allow the probable existence of a multitude of evil spiritual existences, he cannot surely suppose it impossible that they should be organised in some manner and obey a chief who is the most powerful and most highly endowed of them, unless, indeed, he holds the opinion that they form a sort of spiritual mob, and a mob of fools to boot.

The fact is, Mr. Haweis does not know anything about theology, and in his ignorance of it he assumes that certain popular misapprehensions of it are true accounts of it ; and then he holds up these caricatures to public criticism, and thinks to show off his cleverness by finding fault with them. He might just as well draw a picture of a child's rag doll, and use it for a model from which to demonstrate the existence of imperfections in 'the human form divine !'



## HISTORY, ANTIQUITIES, BIOGRAPHY, ETC.

1. *The Forum Romanum.* By JOHN HENRY PARKER, C.B., Hon. M.A. Oxon., F. S. A. Lond., Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum of History and Antiquities in the University of Oxford, &c.
2. *The Via Sacra in Rome.* By JOHN HENRY PARKER, C.B.
3. *The Flavian Amphitheatre, commonly called the Colosseum at Rome, its History and Substructures, compared with other Amphitheatres.* By JOHN HENRY PARKER, C.B. (Oxford: James Parker. London: John Murray, 1876.)

THE first view from the Roman Capitol creates an emotion in the mind of one who has been trained in classic lore only comparable with that caused by a first prospect of Jerusalem. The spectator is standing upon the Capitol: to the right is the Tarpeian Rock, and a little beyond it the Palatine Hill; straight before him is stretched the Forum Romanum, and the Via Sacra; immediately below him, in the Forum, stand up the three columns (one at right angles to the other two), supporting a fragment of cornice; somewhat to his right are the seven columns; to his left the Arch of Septimius Severus; nearly in the centre the single column, which Byron called 'nameless;' and to his right again those three other columns, differing from the first three by being in a straight line with one another. And beyond the boundaries of the Forum proper his eye ranges down the Via Sacra to the Arch of Titus, and the vast bulk of the Colosseum. The Arch of Septimius Severus, the Arch of Titus, the Colosseum, and some other buildings have always told their own tale; but these pillars and shattered temples—what were they? How far did the Forum Romanum extend? Which were the Rostra? Which the Comitium? Where did the Via Sacra begin and end? Which was the Clivus Sacer, and the Clivus Victoriæ? Where did Nero's Colossus stand? Who built the Colosseum? These are questions which could not be answered with any approach to certainty till within the last few years; in some cases we may say till last year. Mr. Parker undertakes to give an answer to them in the two volumes before us, which contain Parts v., vi. and vii. of his great work on the archaeology of Rome.

That which has in so many cases substituted certainty or high probability for loose conjecture and arbitrary dogmatism is the great work of excavation carried on by the Italian Government. The first excavator was the Duchess of Devonshire, who commenced operations with the sanction of the French in 1812 at the north end of the Forum. Prince Demidoff, fired by her example, offered to continue the work from the south end of the Forum to the Colosseum. But the Pope's return to Rome and the restoration of the Papal régime put an end to these aspirations and endeavours. The Popes have never been favourable to antiquarian investigations, and it was not till the final fall of the Temporal Power that the work was again taken seriously in hand, though for some years previously Napoleon III. and Mr. Parker himself had done as much as Italian jealousy would

allow them to do. In the last five years the excavations have been carried on with vigour.

The Forum proper is an oblong space running nearly from north to south, and, like most famous sites, smaller than many persons will have imagined. Its length is 671 feet, its width cannot be stated with perfect certainty, as the eastern side is not yet thoroughly excavated. Towards the northern end it is 202 feet wide, towards the south end about 117 feet. Mr. Parker takes his reader, as he has evidently taken many parties of pedestrians, for a walk down the Forum, and points out the different antiquities as he passes along. The three columns standing at an angle with each other, which have sometimes been regarded as the ruins of the temple of Jupiter Tonans, or again of the temple of Vespasian, are pronounced by Mr. Parker (and he gives good reasons for having come to his conclusion) to belong to the temple of Saturn. The seven columns, which have frequently been called the temple of Saturn, are with some hesitation declared to be the remains of the temple of Vespasian. The single column, 'nameless' in the time of Byron, was proved by the excavations of the year 1813 to be the column of the Emperor Phocas, erected A.D. 608. The three parallel columns are assigned to the temple of Castor and Pollux, the *podium* of which Mr. Parker pronounces to be of the time of the Kings, though the columns themselves only date from the time of Tiberius, by whom the temple was rebuilt. This temple, together with the temple of Antoninus and Faustina, which stood nearly parallel with it towards the east, formed the southern boundary of the Forum proper, the temple of Castor and Pollux being just within it, that of Antoninus and Faustina just outside.

Of all these remains the most exquisite photographs are given in Mr. Parker's volume, as well as of the smaller remains of the temple of Concord in the north-west corner of the Forum, of the Rostra and the *Milliarium Aureum* close by the Arch of Septimius Severus, of the supposed walls of the *Comitium* (one of which represents with great distinctness the three victims in the *Suovetaurilia*, a bull, a ram, and a boar), of the great Basilica Julia, which formed almost the whole of the western side of the Forum, of the famous Arch of the *Cloaca Maxima*, and of other antiquarian ruins.

The *Via Sacra* (including under this term the *Via Sacra* proper, beginning at the south-east end of the Forum and leading southwards to the foot of the *Clivus Sacer*, the slope of the *Clivus Sacer* itself, and at the top of this the *Summa Sacra Via*) is treated much in the same way as the Forum Romanum. The chief buildings of interest in this line are the temple of Antoninus and Faustina already mentioned, the Church of SS. Cosmas and Damian, formed out of three ancient temples, the Basilica of Constantine, the Arch of Titus, and the two Apses standing back to back, so well known under the name of the temples of Venus and Roma, which Mr. Parker altogether, and with no little indignation, denies to be temples at all, pronouncing them to be parts of two Basilicas or market-halls. Among the photographs of these buildings, all of which are excel-

lent, we cannot refrain from calling attention to those which represent the Arch of Titus. The well-known sculpture depicting the seven-branched candlestick and the procession of Jewish captives stands before us with every figure, every gesture, every feature reproduced, and makes us almost believe that we are once more gazing at the original carving in the Summa Sacra Via.

Nowhere have the recent excavations led to such surprising results as in the vast amphitheatre called the Colosseum from the Colossus of Gordianus which stood near it. Little have the many visitors who have walked across the area on which Benedict XIV. erected the cross and stations a hundred years ago, dreamed that they were not walking on the ground-floor at all, but that 21 feet below them was lying the original pavement, and that the space between the seeming and the real bottom was filled with the dens of beasts, canals of water, and all the other paraphernalia necessary for the exhibition of shows. But so it is. The French began to dig in the year 1810, and carried on their diggings for four years, but being stopped by rising water they did not reach the bottom, and their excavations were filled up again. Signor Rosa was also obliged to suspend his operations in 1874 by the same cause which foiled the French, but he procured a steam-engine and persevered until he succeeded in his object. Mr. Parker points out that one result of the excavation is to disprove the theory that the amphitheatre was built by the Flavian Emperors. Ancient walls of tufa are found in the substructures, which are supported by brickwork, recognised by antiquarians as being itself of the date of Nero. He suggests that it was commenced by Scaurus, stepson of Sulla, enlarged and rebuilt by Nero, and finally cased in its present magnificent stone coating by the Flavian family. In the volume on the Colosseum Mr. Parker has not only included photographs of the Roman amphitheatre, but also of the amphitheatres of Capua, Verona, and Pozzuoli, and he has scientifically employed the latter as illustrations of the former.

Mr. Parker has made a very important contribution to the archæology of Rome, and though he is not so much an excavator as an intelligent inspector of excavations, he has fairly won his place in the band of antiquarian scholars who by their discoveries at Nineveh, at Troy, at Mycenæ, and in Asia Minor have laid bare and illustrated to the present generation the half-disbelieved facts of bygone history. He has exhibited knowledge of his subject, diligence and zeal in prosecuting his investigations, and skill in bringing the objects of which he is discoursing before the eye of the reader by means of photography. The literary explanations and descriptions retain too much the characteristics of lectures delivered *viva voce* to a party of listeners, who require to have facts impressed upon them again and again. The bulk of the volumes might be diminished without loss by greater condensation and better arrangement. We must add that in a second edition of the *Forum Romanum* a page should be supplied, which, we should suppose, has dropped out by mistake. An excellent plan of the Forum and the Via Sacra is given, on which the several

antiquarian remains are marked with numbers from 1 to 39, but when we turn to the reference page we find that it abruptly breaks off after giving the names of only nine of the objects designated by these numbers. To a reader anxious to follow his author intelligently there is an absolute cruelty in this, and it must make a great part of Mr. Parker's work incomprehensible by one who has not been in Rome.

*The Christians of Turkey. Their Condition under Mussulman Rule.*

By Rev. W. DENTON, M.A. (Daldy, Isbister, and Co.)

Mr. DENTON must not be angry with us for calling this a partisan pamphlet. He has stated the case *against* the Turks; he must not be surprised if other writers state the case *for* them. Nor can we fail to notice that a large number of the statements here collected are made on mere hearsay evidence, not in any manner authenticated; and that a characteristic defect of the book, arising of course from its being the republication of a pamphlet thirteen years old, is that much of the evidence is of a remote date. So much on merely literary grounds we are bound to say. But we cannot at all regard these necessary deductions from the weight of Mr. Denton's argument as in anywise rendering it nugatory. So far as regards the relative position of Christian and non-Christian races, the situation is probably, in principle, entirely unchanged. To his statements respecting the corruption of the official classes among the Turks, the history of Turkish finance during the last few years has unhappily given additional force; nor, though there is an air of exaggeration running through much of the evidence which he reports, as there always is in narratives picked up, as we presume these were, at second-hand, are the final conclusions to which Mr. Denton comes, other than well considered and weighty. Readers may not endorse them entire, but they will find it wise to consider them carefully if they desire to form an intelligent opinion upon the great question of the day.

The great fact, as to the correctness of which there is no manner of doubt, should be kept in mind :—

That 2,200,000 Mohammedans are pretending to govern 10,673,000 Christians, whom ages ago they cowed into subjection.

But that the ruling Turkish race is dying out with fearful rapidity, almost as fast as the unhappy Hawaiians; and has lost much of its ancient warlike prowess. It does not seem to be fully recognised that the armies which the Turkish Empire has been placing in the field of late, and to which is to be credited the last transient gleam of success which has gilded for a moment the sinking Crescent, are composed in great part of the Albanian Highlanders, who are not Turks at all.

That neither justice nor security is obtainable under the effete government of Constantinople, which is only powerful for extortion and wrong, and that large districts of the fairest provinces of the Empire are losing their population and rapidly going back to the condition of an uninhabited desert.

Such are Mr. Denton's conclusions; and we do not know that

any competent judge will seriously contest their truth. Little remains to the Turk (at least to those Turks with whom Europeans are best acquainted) of the pristine vigour of his Tartar ancestry, except a certain wily dexterity in availing himself of the jealousies of the European Powers, and baffling by subtle finesse one threatening combination after another. What an enforced absence from the European luxury which has enfeebled it, and a lengthened sojourn again under the black sheepskin tent, might do to restore the fibre of the race, it is impossible to say ; but as we write it looks not improbable that the experiment will be tried, and Europe thereby relieved from the *incubus* of a rule which has weighed upon it for four hundred years. But the Conference has now met ; and probably before these pages are given to the public the result of its deliberations will have been made known. Whatever may be said of Mr. Denton's book, at least it is incontestable that, by informing the public mind upon the real nature of Turkish rule, and so helping to determine the political attitude of the English Government, it has become a factor of the result which some keen observers profess to see looming in a not far distant future.

*Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai. A Biographical Sketch.* By the Author of 'The Life of Bossuet,' &c. (London : Rivingtons, 1877.)

THOSE who know—and we may fairly ask, who does not?—the charming books which we have already had from the present writer, will need nothing more than the bare announcement of it to make them welcome this new account of the life of the saintly Fénelon. In it they will find his early connexion with the court admirably sketched, the unhappy controversy with Bossuet fairly and carefully narrated, and, what we think will please them most of all, his subsequent life and career, after his retirement to his diocese, most charmingly depicted. Nothing can possibly be more interesting than the extracts which are here given from the great Archbishop's letters of counsel to friends and relations living in the great world of that most worldly period. That combination of thorough religion and consummate good sense, which one has to notice so constantly in all men who have excelled as 'Directors,' is here to be seen in its very highest development.

*Wives, Mothers and Sisters in the Olden Time.* From French, Italian, and Latin Authors, by Lady HERBERT. (Bentley.)

ALL of us who are old enough to have imbibed the *Christian Year* remember to have longed to read the riddle of the Advent Sunday verse—

'When withering blasts of error swept the sky,  
And Love's last flower seemed fain to droop and die,  
How sweet, how calm the ray benign  
On sheltered nooks of Palestine.  
Then to his early home did Love repair,  
And cheer'd his sickening heart with his own native air.'

It is curious that in the current year this has been fully answered from two such opposite quarters as Lady Herbert and Mrs. Charles. *Wives, Mothers, and Sisters* and *Conquering and to Conquer* are both

drawn from S. Jerome's Letters, and deal with SS. Paula, Eustochium, Marcella, and the other noble Christian ladies of the fifth century. The Life of S. Paula in the first-mentioned is translated from the French of the Abbé La Grange, and the other two Lives in the two volumes, of S. Olympias, the friend of S. Chrysostom, and S. Marcellina, the sister of S. Ambrose, are likewise translations. In all candour and honesty, the book ought to have been called 'Widows, Friends, and Sisters,' for these good ladies were less of wives and mothers than of anything else; but then we suppose the British public would have suspected something it did not like, and would have been less likely to purchase the two blue volumes, so elaborately adorned with a coronet. It is a very odd bait altogether, intended, it seems, to make these grave ascetic biographies be swallowed by mistake for a popular romance, and a curious contrast to Mrs. Charles's unpretending little volume, where, on a fictitious thread, she has given a masterly and effective picture of the same period in a quarter of the space. We all know what French religious biographies are, especially when translated by Lady Herbert, and how strange is the look of the touches of sentiment which have been interlarded into the original narrative. However, we cannot help being very glad of anything that makes these lives better known, and depicts the wonderful mixture of outward Christianity with heathenism, the devotion and the luxury, the faith and the scepticism; though we think the sketch is more effective in the tale than in the biography. The Englishwoman's avowed original matter is more to our taste than the Frenchman's comments. The best part of the French Life is after Paula had left Rome and gone to Bethlehem. Her pilgrimage is very curious, her daughter's letters delightful, and the account of S. Jerome and his comments will interest many who perhaps would otherwise never have heard of them. And it is pleasant that Mrs. Charles has thrown herself so thoroughly into the spirit of the time that the book has a catholic tone about it, and we really think the only weak point is the Goth, who is called dull and simple-minded, but who, nevertheless, makes a wonderful prophecy as to the swarms of Teutonic nations destined to overthrow Rome.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. F. E. PAGET's *Homeward Bound. The Voyage and the Voyagers, the Pilot, and the Port* (Masters and Co.), will recall a name once familiar amongst us as a household word, but which of late years has hardly been heard in any of the circles of active life. Mr. Paget reminds his children, to whom the volume is dedicated, that he has completed a ministry of forty-one years at Elford. In the present work he gives a last gift to the Church, which is not unworthy of its many useful and pious predecessors. It is a survey of the circumstances and aims and occupations of life, by one who feels that 'the voyage of life is well nigh over for him;' and is tinged all through with the solemnity which comes necessarily of such a consciousness. It is not always so clear as it should be to those who are passing through

life, that it is neither a festival nor simply a career, but a venture and a probation. Such a volume as this will afford what help can be given *ab extra* to the production of a better and more sober habit of mind. It will be found useful to the clergy for lending and for the aged in all ranks.

*Womankind.* By C. M. YONGE. (London : Mozley & Smith, 1876.) THIRTY-FIVE chapters of such thorough good sense and sound principle, so clearly stated, and yet with such considerate moderation, it has seldom been our lot to read. It ought to be a handbook for all wives and mothers, and we wish indeed that it might be so also with all young women also who are educated enough to feel its power. It is pleasant reading too, and there is a calmness about its tone and style which, in these days, when almost every one seems to be straining and posing for some effect or other, is extremely grateful. Where all is good, it seems invidious to particularise ; but perhaps we may name the chapter on Woman's Status, and that on Refinement, as giving the key to the purpose of the whole book, while those on Amusement and Spiritual Direction are excellent examples of the way in which she works out and applies her principles. And the chapter on a woman's ' Going In '—a very happy phrase, intended to be the antithesis to a girl's ' Coming Out '—is simply exquisite.

*Why I am a Christian, or a few Reasons for our Faith.* By the Rev. W. E. HEYGATE, Rector of Brighstone (Skeffington), has the sermon form, but is really a closely packed argument or *Apologia pro Fide*, and a most skillfully constructed and able one. We know no work in which the outline of the entire argument is put with such clearness and force, with such wonderful facility of condensation, and withal with a degree of winningness and Christian courtesy that would take the edge off a doubter's bitterness of opposition, if he had any good in him at all. It is a book for all the clergy ; but especially for those in towns, who often need a manual of evidences, clear without being technical, and uncompromising without bigotry. That is just what Mr. Heygate's book is. The scientific objection is not touched at all, which is rather a serious defect. And it is only just the edge of the critical argument which is dealt with either. In any new edition it will be well to devote some considerable space to each of these.

*Sister Agatha : or ' The New Catholic Teaching.'* By the Rev. W. H. PINNOCK, J.L.D. (London : Skeffington, 1876.)

THE writer of this precious volume condescends to approve of Sisterhoods ' in their general aim,' and, *mirabile dictu*, has even ' himself recommended them,' so that he ' even has some young friends labouring worthily in different Homes (we wish he would name them) through his personal instrumentality.' He further adds :—

' I have found them the asylum of disappointed affection, and the shelter of slighted spinsterhood ; a penitentiary for the frail ; a refuge also for foiled, and the purgatory of untamed and rebellious spirits [female caves of Adullam in fact], as well as, I allow, a sanctuary for the devout'—(p. 21.)



After this the reader will not be much surprised that the whole book is given up to representing them as schools of 'spurious catholicity,' as homes of 'superstition,' and as 'the retreat of spurious and unhealthy devotion.' A book which should warn against the less satisfactory tendencies of Sisterhood life—much as Dr. Littledale does in some of his excellent *Monthly Packet* chapters—would be a real boon. But this vulgar book of Dr. Pinnock's drapes up an ugly doll out of his own imagination, and then knocks it down again. There is one subject, however, with which he shows real familiarity, and that is the details of marketing in French country towns and of bargaining with Parisian second-hand-clothes-dealers. We should not have noticed the book had it not come from such a respectable publisher, that, but for a warning, some of our friends might have wasted their shillings on it.

*Village Preaching for a Year.* By REV. S. BARING GOULD. 2 vols. (Skeffingtons.)

THE word that exactly describes these sermons is *brilliant*. They are the outcome of an active and vigorous mind, of high cultivation and wide acquirements; and they are especially and peculiarly *stimulating* to the intellect. They suggest innumerable novel trains of thought; and their illustrations are lavishly given and often singularly beautiful. But the doubt in our mind is, whether this very fulness and richness does not unfit them in some degree for *village* sermons. There *must not be too many ideas in sermons to the poor*. These sermons, too many of them, go far over the heads of poor people. Scarcely any other audience than one composed wholly of clergy would appreciate them fully. And to the clergy they will be really valuable.

*The Haven where we Would Be.* A Second Series of Readings for the Aged. By FORBES E. WINSLOW, M.A., Vicar of Epping (Skeffington and Son), is a continuation of the same type of rather popular and discursive but interesting readings, as his last book contained. They will fill a useful place, being calculated to interest those who find sustained attention difficult from age or sickness; and leading by easy and natural trains of thought to the contemplation of serious subjects.

MR. HOBSON'S *Church Innovations*. (B. M. Pickering, London.) THIS is another pamphlet upon the ritual question, and it would be well if his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom, as a letter, it is addressed, would read and ponder it before the hearing of the appeal in the Ridsdale case. In many particulars he deals very felicitously with the *Quarterly Review's* attack on Mr. MacColl.

WE receive from Messrs. Spottiswoode specimen sheets of a new edition of the English Bible, which is intended to put the English reader in a position, as far as possible, to understand something of the various renderings and readings which are matters of familiarity to scholars. It is an undertaking of which the usefulness can perhaps only be equalled by the tact and discrimination required to

carry it out successfully ; and it is only fair to say that the work is put into good and trustworthy hands, and that, to judge from the leaves before us, the plan seems well carried out and the arrangement of the notes convenient and intelligible. We may add that the book will not only be a very useful one in itself, but that its appearance at the present time may serve as a useful *avant courier* to the coming revised translation of the Bible.

## THE RETROSPECT OF 1876.

### I.

FIRST and foremost in our glance over the year that is gone, it is only becoming to think of those whom that year has taken from us. Of our home losses, by far the most signal has been that of one from whom we might have expected yet many years of valued service, George William, fourth Baron Lyttelton, the manner of whose decease, early in April, gave an added keenness to our sense of loss. Born in 1817, he was educated at Eton and at Trinity College, Cambridge. He took his degree in 1838, when, bracketed with Dr. Vaughan, now Master of the Temple, he was Senior Classic and Chancellor's Medallist. He married, first, in 1839, Mary, the younger sister of Sir Stephen Glynne, who died in 1857, and secondly, in 1869, Sybella Harriet, the relict of H. F. Mildmay, Esq. He had just completed his fifty-ninth year when, on April 19, he was taken from us, as we all know.

He succeeded to his title in 1837 ; in 1839 he became Lord-Lieutenant of his county, and from the very first he distinguished himself by a singularly unselfish and laborious zeal for the public welfare and the public service. Great as his powers were, though rendering not a little political service, he was singularly devoid of mere political ambition, and the major part of his endeavours were devoted to those matters,—not less important, but which lie on the outskirts of what are more technically termed political—of social, moral, and ecclesiastical interest, whether within the narrower sphere of his own county or the wider one of the country at large. Twice only did he hold office, and that only for brief periods. These occasions were when in 1845 he was Under Secretary for the Colonies, and when from 1869 to 1874 he was Chief Commissioner of Endowed Schools. These official positions corresponded with two of the three chief spheres of his spontaneous and voluntary activities. These may be stated as follows : (1) that of colonisation upon the basis of sounder and more definite principles than the haphazard manner in which most of our colonies have sprung up ; (2) that of education in its various phases ; and (3) that of the extension of the Home Episcopate.

As regards the first, he was the principal founder of the Canterbury Settlement, which not many years ago he visited.

As regards the second, he was a member of the Committee of the National Society for Education, and was chiefly concerned in the foundation of the Saltley Training College for schoolmasters, of which he was the President, besides serving on the Schools Inquiry Commission, and being afterwards Chief Commissioner of Endowed Schools, and in 1845 became Principal of Queen's College, Birmingham, and was one of the governing body of Eton College.

As regards the third, he was the persevering and indefatigable promoter of the Society for the Increase of the Home Episcopate and the constant parliamentary advocate of its cause all through the long years of that disheartening resistance, which now that he, the foremost champion, has passed away, seems happily to be coming to an end.

But these more public services did not exhaust Lord Lyttelton's energies, which overflowed into all manner of social and philanthropic activities. Besides being High Steward of Bewdley and Chairman of the Board of Guardians, he was President of the Stourbridge Mechanics' Institute, President of the Working-Men's Club and Institute Union, and President of the South Staffordshire Association for the promotion of adult education and evening schools. His manifold usefulness is further illustrated by the address of condolence to his family from 'The London Association of Foreman Engineers and Draughtsmen,' which speaks of 'their sense of the unflinching energy with which Lord Lyttelton had devoted himself to the promotion of the best interests of the Association.' Other such addresses were numerous, of which we may instance those from the Queen's College, Birmingham, from the Stourbridge Church of England Association, from the Board of Education of the Archdeaconry of Worcester, and the letter of condolence from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

Our limits forbid our doing more than thus to chronicle some of the more outward testimonies to Lord Lyttelton's active and useful life. Of what he *was*, whether as a scholar and a politician, as a Churchman, as a friend, or in the still more sacred sphere of domestic life, it is not for us to speak. In all he was an honour to his age and generation, and happily there is no chance of his memory passing away.

As of our home losses Lord Lyttelton was the chief, so we must reckon Bishop Milman of Calcutta the foremost, when we come to look abroad. There is no need to speak at length regarding him. Well known in the diocese of Oxford, alike at Lamborne and afterwards at Great Marlow, trusted and valued in both by Bishop Wilberforce, he has made his name known throughout the Church by his indefatigable energy in the monster diocese of Calcutta, and at last has died a genuine martyr to his apostolic zeal. He was on the point of returning home to urge that necessity of subdividing his diocese which his death has exemplified, and it is to be hoped that ere long Bishops of Lahore and Rangoon will be consecrated to share the responsibilities and to diminish the area of his excessive labours.

Of other names now belonging to the past we have to mention Sir J. T. Coleridge, the friend and biographer of John Keble, taken from us at the great age of eighty-five ; Dr. J. R. Major, at seventy-nine, who had been for six-and-thirty years the head master of King's College, London, School ; Dr. Dykes, known throughout the whole English-speaking world for his sacred music, revered and beloved by all who knew him, and who died at the early age of fifty-two ; Mr. W. Gresley, latterly of Boyn Hill, who in earlier days had done so much to promote the revival of Church principles, and who for so many years had worked as a voluntary helper at St. Paul's, Brighton ; Miss Sellon, only fifty-six, the dauntless pioneer of the revival of sisterhoods, and who had been so chivalrously supported by that most stout-hearted of Bishops, the late Bishop Phillpotts of Exeter ; and Mr. J. B. Dalgairns, who at fifty-seven, as a priest of the Brompton Oratory, ended a career which had begun as a clergyman in our own communion.

Two Colonial Bishops must here be mentioned, the former the oldest but one as regards date of appointment, Bishop Feild, of Newfoundland, whose Life by Mr. H. W. Tucker (W. Wells Gardner, London) ought to be, and doubtless is, already well known to all our readers ; the latter, one of the youngest, but certainly not the least efficient, Bishop Venables, of Nassau (the Bahamas).

We must also include in our list Mr. G. Smith, the Assyriologist, Dr. Jenkins, the Canon of Maritzburg, and Dr. S. Wesley, the musical composer, and the organist of Gloucester Cathedral.

## II.

Of public and parliamentary events, the most important of all has been the step forward which has been already taken, together with the further advance which is definitely promised, in the direction of the increase of the Episcopate. At the best we cannot yet look for such an addition as is already needful, still less for what in a few years must certainly be demanded. Still the pronouncement of opinion has been such as must result in larger measures hereafter.

In the House of Commons, on the second reading of Mr. Beresford Hope's enabling Bill, the Home Secretary, Mr. Cross, acknowledged at once the existence of the need and recognised the fact that the House was favourably disposed towards its removal. No one, he thought, could avoid coming to the conclusion that the Bishops, in order to do their work fairly, must have assistance. Accordingly, on the distinct promise that the Government would deal with the question in 1877, Mr. Beresford Hope consented to withdraw his Bill.

Outside the House the Churchmen of Devon and Cornwall on the one hand, and of Herts and Essex on the other, with some small help from friends at a distance, have nobly responded to the former part of the Primate's challenge at the Conference of Churchmen held last February ; while Churchmen elsewhere are now preparing to answer the second :

'I, therefore, do hope,' said his Grace, 'that the first result of this

meeting will be the actual founding of the Sees of S. Albans and Cornwall, and that there will be other districts ready to follow the example. And if, in the course of the next year, we have three or four new Sees, we should realise that which was promised by Lord Russell's Government a long time ago, and we should show practically that we are in earnest in the matter.<sup>2</sup>

The See of Truro *has* been endowed and founded, and on the supposition that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners will accede to the expectation that the proceeds of the sale of Winchester House shall be invested in 4 per cent. Railway Debenture Stock instead of Consols, the endowment of the See of S. Albans, by the addition of some 14,000*l.* subscribed for the purpose, is *practically secured*; while churchmen elsewhere are already everywhere on the alert.

1. The people of Liverpool are preparing to subscribe largely to secure a Bishop for themselves. The following resolution of the Committee of the Additional Home Bishoprics Endowed Fund will best show the state of the case :

'That this Committee fully recognise the great importance of the immediate formation of a See at Liverpool, and admit that no part of England has stronger claims upon the co-operation and assistance of this Society. They will, therefore, be rejoiced to hear that Mr. Torr sees his way to raise in Liverpool the sum of 50,000*l.*, as proposed in his own letter of November 20, 1876, towards the endowment of a See of Liverpool, and though they are unable to give a definite engagement to that effect, this Committee will gladly do their utmost to raise the further sum of 10,000*l.*, as suggested by Mr. Torr.'

2. In the diocese of Lincoln an influential Committee is being formed to raise the necessary endowment for a See of Nottinghamshire. Before any public canvass has been made, promises of between 3,000*l.* and 4,000*l.* are reported as an earnest of what may be expected when the Committee is in working order.

3. The Bishop of Durham has publicly signified his intention of giving 1,500*l.* a year from the revenues of that See towards the endowment of a new See for Northumberland.

4. Over 1,500*l.* have already been sent in to the Additional Bishoprics Fund, towards the endowment of a new See to be taken out of the dioceses of Ripon and York.

5. There can be no doubt that a hearty response will greet the appeal of the Bishop of Lichfield and his Committee, so soon as it is issued, for the endowment of a new See for Derbyshire ; while—

6. The people of Bristol are stirring in favour of the restoration of their ancient diocese, towards which we understand the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol is prepared to subscribe largely.

7. We trust to hear before long of the residents in Surrey taking action for the founding of a Bishopric of Southwark.

The establishment of the 'Additional Home Bishoprics Endowment Fund' at the influential Conference to which we have already referred, has greatly stimulated these local movements. Presided over in its early days (in the absence of Lord Lyttelton) with so much earnest ability by Mr. Beresford Hope, guided throughout by a

large Committee of some of the most competent Churchmen of our day, its organisation entrusted to the staff of the Additional Curates Society, it quickly gained general confidence, and its first work of the Committee has been to draft a Report, which has formed a basis for discussion, recommending the formation of the following six new Sees :—

1. A diocese of Northumberland, with Newcastle as a See town, and the splendid S. Nicholas Church as the Cathedral.
2. A diocese for the West Riding of Yorkshire, with Halifax or Bradford as the See town.
3. A diocese for Lancashire, with Liverpool as its See town.
4. A diocese for Nottinghamshire, with Nottingham as its See town, and the fine Church of S. Mary as its Cathedral.
5. A diocese for Warwickshire, with Coventry as its See town.
6. A diocese for South London, with S. Saviour's, Southwark, as its Cathedral.

As regards the collection of funds, it has met with some success, though as regards funds for local purposes local committees must be formed, and local sympathy appealed to. By an advertisement in the *Guardian* of December 20, we see that the following amounts have been paid or promised :—To general fund 19,162*l.* (15,000*l.* of which is given conditionally) ; special for Truro Bishopric 1,100*l.* (to meet 1,200*l.* a year from Lady Rolle, 800*l.* a year from See of Exeter, and over 27,000*l.* from diocesan committee) ; special for St. Albans Bishopric 13,772*l.* (to meet 43,500*l.*, proceeds of sale of Winchester House) ; special for Nottinghamshire diocese 3,095*l.* ; special for Derbyshire diocese 158*l.* ; special for West Riding Bishopric 1,501*l.* The total thus promised from all sources (exclusive of sums derived from existing endowments), amounts to nearly 100,000*l.*, and we trust that the parliamentary action of the now opened year will carry out faithfully the promises of 1876. On three other subjects the Session of 1876 was important from an ecclesiastical point of view.

There was first the severe debate and division in the House of Commons on Mr. Osborne Morgan's Resolution on the Burials question, when he was defeated by a majority of 33, where it is noticeable that the minority included as many as 68 Scotch and Irish votes, so that on this, a distinctively English question, the majority of English votes was no fewer than 101 ; while Mr. Talbot's Bill for unconsecrated burial-grounds was only withdrawn upon the assurance of Mr. Cross that the Government would in 1877 bring in a measure which should provide a 'fair, just, and satisfactory adjustment of the question.'

The most important Act of the Session, and that which was fought over with the greatest keenness, was Lord Sandon's Education Act. This Act had two main objects—(1) to supplement and extend the working of the Act of 1870 ; (2) to correct certain injustices in its operation upon Voluntary Schools. As to (1), it prohibits the employment of children under ten years of age, while it requires certificates of proficiency or of school attendance in the case of children

between ten and fourteen; and it empowers Town Councils and Boards of Guardians to compel school attendance, and thus remove the necessity of a School Board for this purpose, where the school accommodation is adequate; while under carefully devised restrictions School Boards which have no functions may be extinguished. As to (2), the position of efficient Voluntary Schools is improved by permitting them to receive a larger share of their 'earnings by results' than the jealously contrived system of 'deductions' had hitherto permitted. So far as this department of the Act is concerned, we may refer to our own articles of January and July 1876, as setting forth the inequalities which have thus been dealt with; but the desperate resistance of those ultramontanes of Nonconformity, the political Dissenters, showed only too plainly how much honesty there had been in their professions of 1870, that the object of the Act had been only 'to supplement, not supplant' the Voluntary Schools.

The old vexed question as to the Court of Final Appeal has received what we suppose will have to be, for some time at least, a permanent settlement, and it has been enacted that in ecclesiastical causes certain Bishops shall act as assessors, and the rule of the rotation has since been promulgated. An effort was made in the Lower House to defeat this and to leave it a purely lay tribunal; but it was known that in the House of Lords this would meet with the most determined resistance, and so the proposal was defeated by a majority of 18.

Four Bills, which perished in the course of the Session, must here be specified:—(1) The 'Public Worship Facilities Bill,'—a very cautious and moderate Bill, and, as we think, a very good one, introduced in 1875 by Mr. Salt, and in 1876 by Mr. W. Egerton, but thrown out mainly through the fears of the Whig Establishmentarians. (2) The 'Ecclesiastical Offices and Fees Bill'—a large and sweeping measure, under cover of which a stipend was to be provided for Lord Penzance, but which did not seem to have any other tangible object. (3) A measure introduced by Sir T. Chambers, by which Colonial marriages outside of our English marriage laws were to have been legalised in England—a most objectionable Bill. (4) The 'Dilapidations Act' of 1871 has been under the consideration of a Select Committee, which reports in favour of a complete change of system, and that at once, from which we may expect that some legislation may be proposed in the present year.

### III.

Turning now to the proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury, we observe that one of the first matters taken up this year was the 'Bonn Conference and the Old Catholic Movement.' The subject was opened in consequence of a resolution passed by the Anglo-Continental Society inviting the Bishop of Winchester, as President of the Anglo-Continental Society, and the Dean of Lichfield as Prolocutor, to lay before the two Houses of Convocation certain



resolutions adopted at Bonn on the subject of the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost. After speeches by the Bishops of Winchester and Lincoln, and other Bishops in the Upper House, and by the Prolocutor in the Lower House, these resolutions were referred to the Committee of the Lower House on 'Intercommunion with the Eastern Churches;' and they have reported upon them; but the Report has not yet been considered in Convocation. The general tone of the speeches in Convocation,<sup>1</sup> as well as at the recent Congress at Plymouth, at which both the Bishop of Winchester and the Prolocutor were speakers, was one of warm sympathy with the movement, and more especially with Dr. von Döllinger. The Dean of Lichfield, however, while expressing his hearty sympathy, stated that in his judgment the attitude of the Church of England towards the movement should be one of 'Christian sympathy rather than of ecclesiastical interference.' And this probably expresses the general feeling of English Churchmen.

The next important matter was the 'Revision of the Rubrics.' It will be remembered that 'Royal Letters of Business' were issued to the last Convocations, directing them to consider a Report of the Royal Commissioners on the Rubrics which had been put forth in August 1870. This Report, and certain preceding Reports of the same Commissioners, had been partly considered by Convocation before its dissolution at the close of 1873; and the result was the passing of the 'New Lectionary' and the 'Shortened Services Bill.' Upon the re-assembling of the Convocations in the spring of 1874 'Royal Letters of Business' were again issued, to the same purport as those issued to the former Convocations, and since that time the Convocations have applied themselves diligently to the whole question of the Rubrics, regard being had throughout to the very elaborate Report of the Royal Commissioners.

Amongst the most important points to which the Lower House has agreed may be mentioned:—

1. A resolution of the House which we quote in full:—

'Resolved,—That it is very desirable that in the event of legislation in the matter of the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, there should be embodied in the said Book a statement of the Constitutional mode of making such alterations therein as may from time to time be required, viz. "by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the approval of Parliament, upon the recommendation of the Convocations of Canterbury and York."

This, which is really *very important*, might fitly be introduced *at the end of the Ornaments Rubric*, as follows, 'until further order be taken by the authority, &c.'

<sup>1</sup> The speeches of the Bishops of Winchester and Lincoln, and of the Prolocutor of Canterbury, have been published as a pamphlet, price *threepence*, by Messrs. Rivington, with the addition of a most useful appendix, containing the resolutions adopted at the first and second Conference of Bonn. This pamphlet should be procured and preserved by those who collect the more documentary and important pamphlets of each year.

2. A re-arrangement of the Rubrics and Exhortations with reference to notice for the Holy Communion.

This has been agreed to for the sake of clearing ambiguities.

3. The Synodical Declaration, agreed to by the Convocation of Canterbury and by the Lower House of the Convocation of York, was recommended to be appended to the Athanasian Creed in the Book of Common Prayer as a note.

4. A shortened form of Burial Office has been agreed to, such as may be in various cases in which the use of the full office has been objected to. Also a *silent* Burial has been agreed to under certain conditions.

Hymns are permitted at the Burial Office, whether the existing Office or the proposed shortened form; but *not* at the silent interment.

The Lower House have also passed a resolution deprecating any office of burial over the bodies of the *unbaptized*; as it was thought that after the 'silent burial' had taken place there would be no objection to a service in the Church at the discretion of the officiating minister for the comfort of the mourners.

5. A convenient and practical mode has been suggested for the use of the Baptismal Office in those cases in which infants are brought to be baptized, and infants who have been privately baptized are brought to be received into the Church at the same time.

6. There is also a provision of a kindred nature for the Confirmation of persons who have been baptized, but have not had sponsors.

These are amongst the principal provisions. It will be remembered that they have not yet been adopted by the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation. And it must also be noted that the York Convocation (Upper House) have declined to accept the proposed additions to the Ornaments Rubric (*see 1, above*) and the Synodical Declaration on the Athanasian Creed. These disagreements are greatly to be regretted. The addition to the Ornaments Rubric would at once have enabled the Queen, with the authority of the Convocations, to settle Rubrical matters, such as 'Eastward position,' and without going to Parliament, and the 'Synodical Declaration' (Athanasian) embodied in the Prayer-Book would probably have put an end to controversy on that subject for a long time to come.

We have to add that the proceedings in Convocation for 1876 were marked by a free conference between the two Houses on the subject of the 'Burial Office,' which has probably helped much to clear away the mists, and to show the mind of the Church upon the question of the admission of any persons save her authorised ministers to officiate in the churchyards.

Putting aside all extraneous considerations, we have to bear in mind that the ministers of the National Church are responsible to the Church and to the State for guarding the deposit of sound doctrine, which it would be impossible for them to do if others are to come in and say what they like in our consecrated graveyards. Everything points, we consider, to a gradual closing of the existing churchyards, and a legal promise of new graveyards generally, with a certain portion *unconsecrated*.

One word ought to be added by way of mention of the Final Report, dated February 9, 1876, of the Committee on Rubrics, which, of course, has been the basis of all the discussions on Rubrics which have occupied so much of the time of both Houses during the present year. All those of our readers who are anxious to follow out these discussions should provide themselves with a copy of it.

#### IV.

As to other matters, the now ended year has seen the first proceedings under the P. W. Regulation Act of 1874. As early as January 4 the new Judge sat in the Library of Lambeth Palace to hear the first case, that of Mr. Ridsdale, of St. Peter's, Folkestone; and on February 3 he gave his first judgment, in which the defendant was condemned, but an appeal, not yet heard, was entered. Soon after the 'Owston Ferry' case, involving the claim of Dissenting ministers to the title of 'Reverend,' was decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which held that, not being a legal title, no restraint could be placed upon their use of it.

Later on, suits have been promoted and decisions have been given against Mr. Pelham Dale, of St. Vedast, Foster Lane, in the City, and against Mr. A. Tooth, of S. James's, Hatcham, in the latter of which it would seem that the powers of the law will be somewhat tried. Supported by his churchwardens and congregation, Mr. Tooth refuses all compliance, and up to the moment of our writing, actual compulsion has not yet been applied.

Perhaps the most startling incident of the year has been the unlooked for issue of the London School Board election, and its revelation of what may be effected by a vigorous co-operation between the Non-conformists, the Radicals, the Secularists, and the Trades Unions and the Building Societies, under the leadership and organisation of the Liberation Society. Forewarned is forearmed; or, at least, *it ought to be*: and forewarned we certainly are, not only by the event, but by the way in which the event is regarded and *represented* by the two chosen orators of the Liberation Society, in their speeches at Newcastle-on-Tyne, in which they claim it as a victory for themselves and their Society, and as a blow to the Church and to what they call by a new and elegant technicality of their own—its *priestism*. It is to be observed that the result was a surprise to the victors as well as to ourselves, and that the influences by which it was secured are relied upon by the Liberation Society as forces 'with which politicians will have increasingly to reckon for the future'—(*Nonconformist*, Dec. 6, 1876.)

For the rest, the year has been remarkable for the re-opening of no fewer than four of our Cathedrals after restoration. There have been Exeter, of which the choir was re-opened on St. Peter's Day, June 29; Chester, on August 8; Durham, on October 19; and the choir of Salisbury, on All Saints' day. Of new churches or chapels, the most memorable instance has been that of the chapel of Keble College, which was opened on St. Mark's Day.

On the whole, chequered as the year's history has been, no one

can fail to see that an amount of real advance has been made on all sides, which, to say the least, ought greatly to encourage all who are engaged in the Church's cause.

## V.

Turning now to the Colonial Church, the chief events which we have to chronicle are as follows :—

**AUSTRALIA.**—After nearly thirty years of service, Bishop Perry has resigned the See of Melbourne, to which he was consecrated in Westminster Abbey on S. Peter's Day, 1847, along with the late Bishop Gray of Capetown, Bishop Short of Adelaide, and Bishop Tyrell of Newcastle. He has been succeeded by Dr. Moorhouse, late Vicar of Paddington, but the original diocese has been reduced by the formation of the See of Ballaarat, to which Dr. Thornton was consecrated in 1874. The Melbourne diocese, after this reduction, includes an area of 46,000 square miles, and has 92 clergy, while Ballaarat has 40,000 square miles and 38 clergy.

The See of Perth, void by the translation of Bishop Hale to Brisbane, is now filled by Bishop H. H. Parry, who was consecrated coadjutor of Barbados in 1868. The Church in Perth has been disestablished and is in course of disendowment ; but while this latter process is in progress, efforts are being made to raise voluntary endowments to which the Society for Propagating the Gospel and the Colonial Bishops' Council have contributed.

Northern Queensland, from the 22nd parallel of S. latitude to Cape York in the 11th parallel, is now being rapidly colonised, not only by miners, who are birds of passage, but by agriculturists, coffee-planters, &c., who come with the view of settling in the land. It is under the spiritual care of the Bishop of Sydney as Metropolitan, between whose cathedral city and North Queensland there lie the four dioceses of Bathurst, Newcastle, Grafton and Brisbane, the two latter having been severed from the Diocese of Newcastle, largely through the munificence of Bishop Tyrell, 'the only Bishop who has never returned to England' since his consecration in 1847. A Bishopric is contemplated for North Queensland with Bowen, Rockhampton, or Townsville for its city, and the S.P.G. offers the larger portion of the income which will be required at first.

**NEW ZEALAND.**—The Melanesian mission has been carried on with more results than were feasible with the old Church ship. The steam-power of the new 'Southern Cross' enables the clergy to visit more islands than before, and thus the area from which scholars are drawn is enlarged and their numbers increased. The Memorial Church to Bishop Patteson is nearly finished ; but at the same time we must contemplate the head-quarters of the mission being transferred, at no distant date, either to Fiji or to some island nearer to the sphere of work, and healthier for Europeans, when Norfolk Island will once more be the exclusive abode of the Pitcairn community. Mr. J. R. Selwyn will be consecrated as Bishop Patteson's

successor in the spring of the present year. In New Zealand itself the Bishop of Waiaapu, Dr. Williams, who commenced his labours in those islands as far back as 1825 (consecrated 1859), has resigned his See, being paralysed and feeble.

In HONOLULU Bishop Willis continues, almost without notice and without sympathy, his patient work of caring for the remnants of a once manly race, who are dying out, if it be so, through their own vices. By the recent decease of Miss Sellon 400*l.* a year is lost to this diocese.

NORTH AMERICA.—On June 8, 1876, at Bermuda, Bishop Feild closed his long and arduous episcopate of thirty-two years, having completed his 75th year. His life has been already published, and is by this time, we should hope, well known to most of our readers. He is succeeded by his coadjutor, Bishop Kelly, who was consecrated in 1867, for whom a coadjutor, *cum jure successionis*, is now being sought.

In Columbia the defection of Dean Cridge to the Cummins sect has led to a schism which, under the assumed name of the Free Church of England, has reached even to our own country: but on the opposite side of the Rocky Mountains, in the plains of the Saskatchewan, the Bishop, Dr. McLean, consecrated 1874, is well abreast of the advancing tide of immigration, and is planting the Church in what promises to be a most successful colony.

WEST INDIES.—Here one of the most energetic and devoted of our Colonial Bishops, Dr. Addington Venables, of Nassau (the Bahamas), deceased on October 8, 1876, at the early age of forty-nine, after an episcopate of thirteen years. This is another case of progressive disendowment, and, by the Bishop's death, an income of 1,000*l.* a year from the Colonial treasury is lost to the See. Its whole income now is but 68*l.* a year, and the diocese is the poorest in Christendom. There is a good diocesan organisation, and one of the last of Bishop Venables' labours was the perfecting of the Synodal arrangements, and the election of the Bishop rests with the Synod. An appeal for funds is put forth by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the West Indian Bishops. The Society for Propagating the Gospel has contributed 1,000*l.* towards the endowment of the See, and 200*l.* a year towards the Bishop's income.

In other West Indian dioceses the disestablished Churches are showing signs of fresh life. Bishop Rawle, of Trinidad, exhibits in a new diocese the same administrative powers which marked his rule in Codrington College. Antigua is getting together endowments which will make her indifferent to the loss of the State subsidies, when, as must soon be the case, the last has fallen in. In Guiana, where Bishop Austin has laboured for six-and-thirty years (consecrated 1841) and is now the senior Colonial Bishop, the Church is more than flourishing. The immense number of Coolies brought from India under a Government ordinance have rendered it practically a missionary diocese, and its clergy minister on the Western Continent in Oriental languages to many thousands of Hindoos.

SOUTH AFRICA.—The Provincial Synod held at Capetown on the

Feast of the Conversion of S. Paul, 1876, was attended by six Bishops, and the seventh Bishop of the province, Bishop Wilkinson, of Zululand, tendered his resignation of his See. The Synod, among other things, made provision for the election of his successor and for the foundation of a Bishopric in the Transvaal Republic, which has hitherto been cared for by the Bishop of Bloemfontein, though never included within his diocese. The accounts which keep reaching home of the progress of the Bloemfontein work are certainly among the most stirring and the most interesting of all the narratives of our day, but in a mere summary like this we can do no more than refer to them in passing, and add that owing to special circumstances the cost of all necessities of life is so extravagantly great that corresponding pecuniary help from home is peculiarly necessary. The Bishop's commissary is the Rev. G. C. White, Vicarage, Malvern Link.

In EASTERN AFRICA Bishop Steere has shown his determination no longer to remain in Zanzibar, but has gallantly made his way into the interior, and has established a station in M'Taka's country, while to the northward one of his clergy, the Rev. J. Farler, has settled himself and a number of freed slaves at Magila.

In MADAGASCAR the Bishop, whose appointment was so sedulously, and for a long time, to our infinite discredit, so successfully hindered by Nonconformists, has given the best possible refutation to the statements made to the effect that the whole island was enthusiastically devoted to a Calvinistic congregationalism, by the amount of his episcopal ministrations to members of our own communion and by his report of the immense populations altogether outside the scope, not merely of missionary organisations, but even of missionary schemes. In a long, and often perilous, tour of seventeen weeks, he has explored the whole of the northern portion of the island, in which alone he finds ample work for another Bishop and suitable staff of clergy, and no wonder, when the entire island is about as large as the whole of France. Besides the capital, where, in addition to the usual accompaniments of a missionary station, there are the less common adjuncts of a hospital and a theological college, there are already important stations, with one or more clergy at each, at Sambava in the north, at Foule Point, at Tamatave and Andavoranto on the East Coast, and a multitude of subordinate stations under the charge of catechists.<sup>1</sup> Two natives of Madagascar have been ordained since the Bishop arrived, and others are in training for Holy Orders, while the amount of work which is being done in the way of education, alike for boys and for adult women and girls, is very remarkable.

In CEYLON a new Bishop has had the courage to grapple with an old difficulty; and Bishop Copleston, in his missionary zeal, has found himself in collision with a system of old standing in respect of the Tamil-speaking Coolies, who form a sort of nation within a nation.

<sup>1</sup> Here we cannot help calling attention to an excellently compiled Report on the Madagascar Mission, from the year 1874 to November 1876, which may be had, we believe, of the Bishop's commissary, the Rev. J. H. Du Boulay, Southgate Hill, Winchester.

in his diocese. The case on the Bishop's side is carefully and temperately stated in a pamphlet (Parker and Co., Oxford) by the Rev. R. C. Moberly, entitled 'An Account of the Question between the Bishop and the Church Missionary Society.' The claim of the Church Missionary Society amounts to little less than to a complete independence of diocesan authority, and of freedom to insulate their own sphere of work from all inter-relations with the local clergy and the local organisation. It is nothing new. The only new thing is the presence of a Bishop who desires to bring the whole Church work of the diocese under one *régime*. Bishop Daniel Wilson of Calcutta has been, so far as we know, the one Bishop prior to Bishop Copleston who has ventured on the like course, and those of us who are old enough to remember that controversy will not be surprised at the present excitement. Happily, the question seems to be discussed upon its merits, and with less than the usual amount of imported bitterness, so that there is some hope of good coming out of the controversy.

As to INDIA, we have to chronicle the consecration of Bishop Mylne, of Bombay, as successor to the lamented Bishop Douglas, the decease of the saintly Bishop Milman of Calcutta, and the consecration of Archdeacon Johnson, of Chester, in his room. At home the whole year has been full of schemes for the infinitely needed extension of the Episcopate in our Indian empire. So far as any immediate result is concerned, new Bishops of the old type at Lahore and Rangoon, to relieve the absurdly huge diocese of Calcutta, and the consecration of Drs. Caldwell and Sargent as coadjutors to relieve Madras so soon as Bishop Johnson arrives, appear to be all that can be expected. But we cannot believe that the day of better things is far distant. Coadjutors are unsatisfactory, however excellent the men, and the refusal of the Crown to permit a Church Missionary Society's missionary to be consecrated Bishop of Travancore looks as if the objections were now fully recognised. But more Bishops India *must* have, and when once the whole staff of its Bishops shall meet in Synod, men whose personal labour has taught them the need, we doubt not that a way will be devised to meet the difficulty, and for what Bishop D. Wilson used to desire, namely, 'a return to the principles of primitive episcopacy.'

Condensed as are these details, our survey has occupied some considerable space. Thirty years ago it would have been very different, and the difference marks the ground which has been won. A survey of our existing Colonial and missionary Church has now to deal with two-and-fifty Dioceses, a number yearly on the increase; while in the United States the Church now numbers forty-three home and fifteen missionary Bishops. It will indeed be a world-wide gathering when in 1878 the next Pan-Anglican Conference shall meet under the presidency of the successor of S. Augustine.



[illegible]